

## LIEUTENANT

Roy E. Neufeldt

## LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Cecil G. Allison  
 Richard S. Baird  
 George G. Dunn  
 John E. Fishburn III  
 Theodore E. Lide, Jr.  
 Gale W. Nuernberger  
 William J. Shoemaker  
 Carlton B. Smith

## ENSIGNS

Daniel S. Curran  
 Gorman L. Fisher, Jr.  
 Derrell B. Hauser  
 Murray A. Luftglass

The following-named ensign of the Medical Service Corps of the Navy for permanent appointment in the line:

Frederick J. Orrik, Jr.

## CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 13, 1953:

## POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Ormonde A. Kieb, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

## SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 16, 1953

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, again through sleep and darkness safely brought, restored to life and power and thought, we face a new day and the tasks of a new week. Wilt Thou lift our duty above drudgery. Even in the heat and burden of noonday's task let not our strength fail nor our vision fade. Make us patient and considerate one with another in all the fret and jar of human contacts, remembering that even in the glare of public gaze each fights a hard battle to maintain his integrity and walks a lonely way. Give us, O Lord, a reverence for truth, a deep desire to think and speak with utter candor, and a passion to hasten the day when the rule of justice and righteousness shall engirdle the earth. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 13, 1953, was dispensed with.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—  
ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1188) to amend the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to continue in effect

certain of the provisions thereof, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING  
SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today, beginning at 2 o'clock.

## LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE—RESOLUTION OF LITHUANIAN AMERICANS OF MANCHESTER, N. H.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution adopted by Lithuanian Americans of the city of Manchester, N. H., relating to the observance of the 35th anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania, signed by the chairman and secretary, and sundry other patriotic American citizens of Lithuanian descent, with the request that it be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as follows:

Unanimously voted by Lithuanian Americans of the city of Manchester, N. H., at the observance of the 35th anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania, held at the hall, 83 Hanover Street, on the 22d day of February 1953:

"Whereas in the eyes of the people around the world, the United States has been the strongest champion of the oppressed; and

"Whereas the traditional American leadership in principles of justice, morality, and equal rights to all human beings on the earth paved the way for the American supremacy in the political, military, and economic world affairs which this country is today providing for the benefit of mankind; and

"Whereas intolerable conditions which now prevail in eastern and central Europe, including Lithuania and other Baltic States, should be of greatest concern to the United States as no peace and stability in the world is possible without participation of that part of Europe which comprises a force of over 100 million people separated from the rest of the world by the Iron Curtain; and

"Whereas the mere denial to recognize the Soviet claims of that area, when not accompanied by any positive action on the part of the United States to back its stand, did not and will not bear the slightest effect on the Kremlin masters: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That we, patriotic American citizens of Lithuanian descent, concerned about security and prosperity of this great country and over the fate of our native land, Lithuania, now under brutal Soviet yoke, appeal to the Government of the United States to adopt a clear and firm foreign policy such as America's leading role in the world affairs necessitates; to incorporate the liberation of Lithuania and other Soviet-enslaved countries, as an integral and inseparable part, in the program of the United States foreign policy; to reject any general peace settlement in Europe unless those countries are given an opportunity to freely choose their own form of government under which they wish to live; to inaugurate all suitable means to aid liberation movements in the Soviet-enslaved countries and to enlist their cooperation in the global efforts to fight international communism; to intensify the Amer-

ican campaign of truth inside Iron Curtain and to enlighten the American public regarding the barbarous Soviet tactics in subjugating and destroying free nations; to speed ratification of the Genocide Convention and to implement the ratification by decisive action of the United States Government within the United Nations to make Soviet Russia responsible for the crimes committed in the Baltic States and other countries behind the Iron Curtain; be it finally

"Resolved, That this meeting pledge all possible support of the Lithuanian Americans to the Federal Government in its efforts to resist the evil Communist forces of aggression and to sustain peace and freedom everywhere."

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on Finance:

"Be it resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring):

"Whereas there is definite need for prompt and extensive correction of the critical deficiencies of our streets and highways in the interest both of our economy and our national security; and

"Whereas highways of the country, including the streets and bridges, are by tradition and by law the property and responsibility of the States and the subdivisions thereof; and

"Whereas many of the States are in need of additional revenue for the construction and maintenance of their highways, but are experiencing extreme difficulty in their efforts to obtain additional revenues for highway purposes because of the magnitude of the existing overall tax burden now imposed upon the motor-using public; and

"Whereas the Federal Government imposed its taxes on motor vehicles, motor fuel, lubricating oil, tires and tubes, parts and accessories as temporary emergency measures during the depression of the early 1930's, but has continued these taxes in effect ever since at increasing rates; and

"Whereas taxation of motor fuel traditionally has been relied upon by the States to produce a major part of the revenues necessary to construct and maintain their highways, and that the Federal Government, by its continued intrusion in this field, has so increased the tax burden on the highway user so virtually to preclude further increases in such taxes by the States; and

"Whereas the Governors' Conference, the Western Governors' Conference, the 11th General Assembly of the States, the National Grange, and the American Farm Bureau Federation recently have urged immediate repeal of the Federal gasoline tax: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Legislature of New Hampshire urgently requests that the Federal Government retire immediately from the field of motor fuel taxation; be it further

"Resolved, That the Governor send copies of this resolution to the representatives of our State in Washington with the request that they appear at the appropriate time before the appropriate committees of Congress for the purpose of urging that the Federal tax on motor fuel be eliminated.

"RAYMOND K. PURSONS,  
 "Speaker of the House  
 of Representatives.

"LANE DWINNELL,  
 "President of the Senate.

"HUGH GREGG,  
 "Governor.

"Passed February 25, 1953.

"Attest: ENOCH D. FULLER,  
 "Secretary of State."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Finance:

**"House Concurrent Resolution 7**

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to approve legislation designed to provide a stabilized market for the products of western mines

*"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein):*

"Whereas the base metal mining industry of the United States has suffered serious curtailment, and is threatened with further curtailment, through dumping of lead and zinc from low wage foreign countries; and

"Whereas the domestic lead and mine miner has suffered from the effects of currency devaluation and the monopolistic practices of foreign governments in the purchase and sale of metals; and

"Whereas Utah, as well as many other sections of the United States, is in a large measure dependent upon the new wealth created by the mining and processing of these metals for the maintenance of its economy and for the purchasing of commodities needed by Utahans but not produced in Utah; and

"Whereas unemployment and loss of production caused by dumping from low-wage countries is depriving local, county and State governments of much needed tax income; and

"Whereas the American taxpayer has been called upon to finance the expansion of foreign production of metals and minerals in competition with home production to the detriment of the development of reserves vitally needed in this country for national security; and

"Whereas propaganda from Washington during recent years has endeavored, without foundation, to place this country in a have-not class, to the end that tariffs on basic commodities, including metals, should be abandoned: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein),* That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby memorialized to approve legislation for the stabilizing of the market for metals at prices consistent with the prevailing domestic economic level through the enactment of constructive legislation providing for a sliding scale stabilization import tax. This legislation will promote the development of our natural resources and protect our domestic economy in the interest of national security; be it further

*"Resolved,* That the secretary of state of the State of Utah be, and he is hereby authorized and directed, to send copies of this concurrent memorial to the President of the United States, to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Utah in the National Congress and to the Honorable Secretary of the Interior of the United States."

**By Mr. GILLETTE:**

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

**"Senate Concurrent Resolution 12**

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has recently held that the activities of a private contractor performing services for the Atomic Energy Commission are to be treated as activities of the Atomic Energy Commission itself for the purpose of securing immunity from State and local taxes: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the senate of the 55th general assembly (the house concurring),* That the Legislature of the State of Iowa respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to amend the Atomic Energy Act so as to eliminate therefrom any language which may be interpreted as providing for the

extension of tax exemption to private contractors with the Atomic Energy Commission or to the vendors of such contractors, contrary to the well-established principles of intergovernmental relations which have assured to the States and their political subdivisions full power to impose nondiscriminatory taxation upon private persons who deal with the Government; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from Iowa in the Congress of the United States."

**By Mr. MAGNUSON:**

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

**"Senate Joint Memorial 4**

*"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas the establishment of peace between Israel and the Arab States is essential to the free world; and

Whereas the State of Israel is a progressive democracy which is desirous of cooperating with the free world in defense of freedom and against totalitarian aggression; and

"Whereas it is authentically reported that Great Britain is selling jet aircraft to the Arab States and that the United States intends to facilitate the acquisition by the Arab States of military equipment; and

"Whereas the acquisition by the Arab States of the means of waging war, while those states remain technically at war with Israel, imperils the security of the State of Israel and may be the means of provocation of war in the Middle East; and

"Whereas we view with dismay the portent of strife in the Middle East and the endangering of the security of the progressive democracy of Israel; Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled,* That we respectfully petition the President of the United States and the Secretary of State to take such action to prevent the flow of arms and materials of warfare to said Arab States; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That the President of the United States and the Secretary of State use the influence of their office and of these United States to the accomplishment of a speedy and honorable era of peace between Israel and the Arab States; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That copies of this memorial be transmitted immediately to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States; and to each Member of Congress from the State of Washington."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

**"House Joint Memorial 3**

*"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, and the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas the extension by proclamation of the Olympic National Park, of January 4,

1940, includes within its boundaries the corridor north of Quinalt Lake and River and the highway therein known as the North Shore Road; and

"Whereas this extension of boundaries brings within the jurisdiction of the National Park administration a considerable area of land owned by bona fide settlers together with the only road affording entry into and egress from the homes of these settlers, some of which were settled as early as 1888; and

"Whereas the land in question does not belong to the Olympic National Park nor to the United States, but belongs to private citizens who hold it by virtue of patents granted by the United States; and

"Whereas no timber land owned by the United States or the State of Washington is involved in this area which contains approximately 4,000 acres, of which 2,500 acres are potentially tillable; and

"Whereas the area is now the permanent residence of 177 people who enjoy electric lights, telephone service, rural free delivery mail, and bus service for children to an accredited high school; and

"Whereas the National Park Service could at its discretion, isolate the residents of the area by its failure to maintain a road: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate and House Representatives of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled,* That we respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to speedily enact legislation to readjust the boundaries of the Olympic National Park so as to restore the private land and road along the north shore of Quinalt Lake and River to the administration of the agency or agencies under whose jurisdiction it existed prior to the proclamation of January 4, 1940; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable Secretary of the Interior, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of Washington."

**By Mr. BARRETT:**

Three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

**"House Enrolled Joint Memorial 1**

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to passing legislation to modernize the 160-acre limitation now imposed upon farm units in federally financed reclamation projects

"Whereas the 160-acre limitation upon farm units involving federally financed reclamation projects is based upon an outworn concept and has become a serious hindrance to the development of the West through reclamation; and

"Whereas, in the case of presently irrigated private lands which need supplemental irrigation, the proper economic size of farm units has already been determined, as a result of decades of trial and error; and

"Whereas there exist in the West many areas which are naturally less favored than others, by reason of short growing seasons due to high elevation, high latitude, or otherwise; and

"Whereas such less favored areas cannot be reclaimed under the present land limitation provisions because they can be made productive only by the use of machinery, the cost of which is not warranted if the farm is limited to 160 acres or less: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of the 32d Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such legislature concurring),* That the Congress of the United States of America, be and it is hereby memorialized to promptly, diligently and fairly consider and act upon

at this session, legislation designed to modernize the acreage limitation in the following manner: (1) removal of the limitation in the case of lands to which supplemental water is to be supplied, and (2) determination of the economic size of farm units in a new land project by the appropriate State official or agency; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, United States Senator LESTER C. HUNT, United States Senator FRANK A. BARRETT and Representative in Congress WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, to the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of Reclamation, and to the governors and legislatures of the following States: Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, and Washington.

"DAVID FOOTE, Sr.,  
"Speaker of the House."  
"F. W. BARTLING,  
"President of the Senate."

"Approved February 17.

"C. J. 'Doc' ROGERS,  
"Acting Governor."

"Senate Enrolled Joint Memorial 5

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to redefine the boundaries of Grand Teton National Park

"Whereas chapter 950, Public Law No. 787, 81st Congress, established Grand Teton National Park which embraces a large area described therein; and

"Whereas part of the encompassed area is not necessary for the proper utilization of the park; and

"Whereas much of the land is valuable for ranching and farming purposes and could be better utilized on the tax rolls of Teton County; and

"Whereas the use of the entire area as now described derogates from the proper conservation, management, and control of the wildlife of the area: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 32d Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the House concurring), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to adopt legislation redefining the boundaries of the Grand Teton National Park to conform to the following natural boundaries, to wit: Beginning at a point where the present south boundary of the Grand Teton National Park located along the section lines between sections 17 and 20, township 42 north, range 116 west, intersects the bluff above the west bank of the Snake River; and thence continuing in a northeasterly direction along the said bluff above the west bank of the Snake River to a point where said bluff intersects the east boundary line of section 13, township 44 north, range 115 west; thence north along the range line between range 114 west and range 115 west to the northeast corner of section 12, township 44 north, range 115 west; thence along section lines to the southwest corner of section 6, township 44 north, range 115 west, being a point on the east boundary line of the original Grand Teton National Park; thence northerly following the boundary line of the original Grand Teton National Park to the northeast corner of said original Grand Teton National Park; thence southwesterly along the north boundary of the original Grand Teton National Park to a point on the divide between Snake River and Teton River where it intersects the western boundary of the present Grand Teton National Park; thence southerly and easterly along the boundary of the present Grand Teton National Park to the point of beginning; and be it further

"Resolved, That the portion of the area which by this memorial would be excluded from the present boundaries of the Grand

Teton National Park be transferred to the Teton National Forest, and that part of the land suitable for agriculture and ranching purposes be returned to private ownership as provided by law; and be it finally

"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of said United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, United States Senator LESTER C. HUNT, United States Senator FRANK A. BARRETT, and Congressman WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON.

"F. W. BARTLING,  
"President of the Senate."  
"DAVID FOOTE, Sr.,  
"Speaker of the House."

"Approved February 21.

"C. J. 'Doc' ROGERS,  
"Acting Governor."

"Senate Enrolled Joint Memorial 7

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America by proper action to quitclaim unto the State of Wyoming all right, title, and interest in and to all sections 16 and 36 within the State of Wyoming, whether surveyed or unsurveyed, so as to vest immediately in the State of Wyoming not only legal title to sections 16 and 36, when surveyed and not otherwise disposed of, but also with an inalienable proprietary interest in all sections which are surveyed or were surveyed as of the date of the Enabling Act of July 10, 1890

"Whereas, by decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *The United States of America v. State of Wyoming and Ohio Oil Company*, rendered during the October term of 1946, it was determined that the enabling act of July 10, 1890 (26 Stat. 222-C-664), properly construed, would operate to vest title in the State of Wyoming to sections 16 and 36 only as of the date that an official survey of the lines of the sections were approved by the Commissioner of the General Land Office and then only if no inconsistent disposition of the lands had been previously made; and

"Whereas, subsequent to the date of such enabling act and on, to wit, December 6, 1915, these unsurveyed lands had, by Presidential order, been placed in a petroleum reserve; and

"Whereas the State of Wyoming considers that the intention of the Congress of the United States at the date of the admission of this State into the Union was, in fact, to grant unto the State of Wyoming for the support of common schools each and every section numbered 16 and 36 in every township of this State whether then surveyed or unsurveyed, and which had not been previously sold or otherwise disposed of by, or under the authority of, any act of Congress; and

"Whereas, notwithstanding there is contained in such enabling act a proviso that, in the event a section numbered 16 or 36 had been previously disposed of, the State would be entitled to select lands in lieu thereof, the State of Wyoming considers that such in lieu selections will fail to duly compensate the State for the loss of certain sections 16 and 36 which were not within approved survey at the date of such enabling act due to the fact that this State, believing itself to be the owner of such unsurveyed lands, had through leases and otherwise caused exploration, discovery, and development thereunder subsurface minerals and values showing such questioned unsurveyed sections to have peculiar and irreplaceable values; and

"Whereas the State of Wyoming believes that in equity and good conscience the Congress of the United States should, by proper action, quitclaim unto the State of Wyoming all right, title, and interest in and to all sections 16 and 36 within the State of Wyoming, whether surveyed or unsurveyed, so as to vest immediately in the State of Wyoming

not only legal title to sections 16 and 36, when surveyed and not otherwise disposed of, but also with an inalienable proprietary interest in all sections which are unsurveyed or were unsurveyed sections as of the date of the Enabling Act of July 10, 1890: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 32d Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the House of Representatives of such legislature concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be and it is hereby memorialized to by proper action quitclaim unto the State of Wyoming all right, title, and interest in and to all sections 16 and 36 within the State of Wyoming, whether surveyed or unsurveyed, so as to vest immediately in the State of Wyoming not only legal title to sections 16 and 36 when surveyed and not otherwise disposed of, but also with an inalienable interest in all sections which are unsurveyed or were unsurveyed sections as of the date of the Enabling Act of July 10, 1890; be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, United States Senator LESTER C. HUNT, United States Senator FRANK A. BARRETT, and Representative in Congress WILLIAM H. HARRISON.

"F. W. BARTLING,  
"President of the Senate."  
"DAVID FOOTE, Sr.,  
"Speaker of the House."

"Approved February 25.

"C. J. 'Doc' ROGERS,  
"Acting Governor."

By Mr. WELKER:

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relating to construction of national forest highways within the State of Idaho, and the construction of a new sewage-disposal and treating plant, together with other facilities at Sandpoint, Idaho; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See joint resolutions printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Acting President pro tempore on March 13, 1953, p. 1919, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF LEGISLATURE OF NEVADA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I present three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Nevada. They are Senate Joint Resolution 12, memorializing the Congress of the United States to approve legislation designed to provide a stabilized market for the products of domestic mines; Senate Joint Resolution 13, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to restore the gold standard and to increase the price of gold commensurate with the present value of the dollar; and Senate Joint Resolution 14, urging the establishment of a mine rescue station at Reno, Nev., by the United States Bureau of Mines.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolutions be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolutions were received, referred, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Resolution 12

"Senate joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to approve legislation designed to provide a stabilized market for the products of domestic mines

"Whereas the base metal mining industry of the United States has suffered serious

curtailment, and is threatened with further curtailment, through dumping of lead and zinc from low-wage foreign countries; and

"Whereas the domestic lead and zinc miner has suffered from the effects of currency devaluation and the monopolistic practices of foreign governments in the purchase and sale of metals; and

"Whereas Nevada, as well as many other sections of the United States, is in a large measure dependent upon the new wealth created by the mining and processing of these metals for the maintenance of its economy and for the purchasing of commodities needed by Nevada but not produced in Nevada; and

"Whereas unemployment and loss of production caused by dumping from low-wage countries is depriving local, county, and State governments of much needed tax income; and

"Whereas the American taxpayer has been called upon to finance the expansion of foreign production of metals and minerals in competition with home production to the detriment of the development of reserves vitally needed in this country for national security; and

"Whereas propaganda from Washington during recent years has endeavored, without foundation, to place this country in a have-not class; to the end that tariffs on basic commodities, including metals, should be abandoned: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada (jointly)*, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to approve legislation for the stabilizing of the market for metals at prices consistent with the prevailing domestic economic level through the enactment of constructive legislation providing for a sliding scale stabilization import tax. This legislation will promote the development of our natural resources and protect our domestic economy in the interest of national security; be it further

*Resolved*, That duly certified copies of this resolution shall be forwarded to each member of the Nevada congressional delegation, to the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives."

To the Committee on Banking and Currency:

#### "Senate Joint Resolution 13

"Senate joint resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to restore the gold standard and to increase the price of gold commensurate with the present value of the dollar

"Whereas, by constitutional provision, mining was made the paramount industry of the State of Nevada; and

"Whereas the industry and well-being of many communities in the State of Nevada and the Western United States have been seriously impaired due to the present price of gold, established in the year 1934 and since maintained regardless of the increase in the commodity index and cost of living since the year 1939; and

"Whereas the cost of labor and all other commodities, especially such costs as enter into the production of gold, have increased 100 percent or more; and

"Whereas the purchasing power of the dollar has decreased to approximately one-half of what it was in 1939; and

"Whereas we believe that to stabilize the currency of the Nation it will be necessary to return to the gold standard, with a price for gold at a comparable dollar value; and

"Whereas our country does not have a gold standard, with gold and the dollar interchangeable at a fixed ratio; and

"Whereas the living standards of our country have been lowered and are being lowered continuously by unwarranted inflation of the country's currency; and

"Whereas the restoration of the gold standard with gold and the dollar freely inter-

changeable at a fixed ratio would stabilize all living costs, including the cost of labor, materials, and commodities as well as the operation of our Government; and

"Whereas all restrictions on the purchase, sale, and ownership of gold by American citizens should be removed, in view of the demand for and the price of gold in all foreign countries, in order that gold may seek a natural level to be ascertained by actual sales; and

"Whereas it is advisable for our Government in the best interests of our national economy to not only maintain the present price of \$35 per ounce for gold, but to establish a price for gold based upon the present purchasing power of the dollar, which would indicate a price level more than double the price established in the year 1934 and the commodity index of the year 1939: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada (jointly)*, That the President and the Congress of the United States be respectfully requested to restore the gold standard at the earliest practicable time and that the price of gold be reestablished at a price consistent with its present cost of production and the purchasing power of our inflated currency dollar; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Nevada be authorized and directed to transmit properly certified copies of this resolution to the President of the Senate; the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Representatives of the State of Nevada in the Congress of the United States."

To the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

#### "Senate Joint Resolution 14

"Senate joint resolution urging the establishment of a mine-rescue station at Reno, Nev., by the United States Bureau of Mines

"Whereas the United States Bureau of Mines has mine-rescue stations in practically all the western mining States, with the exception of Nevada; and

"Whereas the States of Nevada and California comprise region III of the United States Bureau of Mines, for which a mine-rescue station is maintained at Berkeley, Calif.; and

"Whereas the Berkeley mine-rescue station is the only United States Bureau of Mines rescue station set up to provide assistance in Nevada in case of mine disasters; and

"Whereas the location of the mine-rescue station at Berkeley necessitates the moving of mine-rescue equipment and personnel, in case of an emergency in Nevada, by truck or airplane across the Sierra Nevada mountains at considerable cost and with the loss of valuable time, especially during the winter months when the mountain area receives heavy snowfalls and when airplane service is sometimes not available; and

"Whereas the establishment of a mine-rescue station at Reno, Nev., would provide adequate protection for the entire State of Nevada and would provide better protection for many California mining communities as well: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada (jointly)*, That Mr. J. Howard Bird, Chief, Accident Prevention and Health Division, United States Bureau of Mines, 428 Acheson Building, Berkeley 4, Calif., be memorialized to take whatever steps may be necessary to secure the establishment at Reno, Nev., of a mine-rescue station of the United States Bureau of Mines; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Director of the United States Bureau of Mines in Washington, D. C., and to our congressional delegation in Washington, D. C."

## FEDERAL GASOLINE TAXES—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF KANSAS LEGISLATURE

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference Concurrent Resolution 2, adopted by the Legislature of the State of Kansas, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the withdrawal of the Federal Government from the field of gasoline taxes.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### Senate Concurrent Resolution 2

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the withdrawal of the Federal Government from the field of gasoline taxes

Whereas the Federal gasoline tax is levied upon the users of American highways; and

Whereas the highway system of this country and the highway systems of the several States are rapidly deteriorating because the funds needed to develop and maintain a modern highway network are not available; and

Whereas the Federal Government is now distributing to the States only about two-thirds of the revenue which it is deriving from the Federal gasoline tax and is diverting the remainder to its other purposes; and

Whereas if the Federal Government would withdraw from the field of gasoline taxes and the several States would increase the taxes imposed by them on gasoline and motor vehicle fuels in an amount equal to the Federal tax on gasoline, a much larger amount of revenue would be available to the several States for the purpose of developing and maintaining a modern system of highways therein; and

Whereas the 11th general assembly of the States which was held in Chicago, Ill., in the month of December 1952, at which practically all of the States of the United States were represented, went on record as favoring the withdrawal of the Federal Government from the gasoline tax field; and

Whereas the National Conference of Governors and the Midwestern Regional Conference of the Council of State Governments, of which the State of Kansas is a member, have declared by appropriate resolutions that the Federal Government should withdraw from the gasoline tax field: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Kansas (the House of Representatives concurring therein)*, That we respectfully urge and request the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will provide for the withdrawal of the Federal Government from the field of gasoline taxes; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the secretary of state be directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and each member of the Kansas delegation in the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate and to the respective houses of the legislatures of the several States of the United States.

## THE AGRICULTURE PROGRAM—RESOLUTION OF GREENWOOD COUNTY (KANS.) CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and

ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Greenwood County (Kans.) Cattle-men's Association at their annual meeting on March 4, 1953, commending and supporting Secretary of Agriculture Ezra T. Benson in his agriculture program.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION,  
Eureka, Kans., March 12, 1953.  
Senator ANDREW F. SCHOEPEL,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SCHOEPEL: The Greenwood County Cattlemen's Association in annual meeting Eureka, Kans., March 4, 1953, hereby resolves to commend and support Ezra T. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, in his efforts to expand markets for, and increase efficiency in, the production of and marketing of agricultural products. To the degree that this program is successful, the freedom and well-being of agriculture and the general welfare of all Americans is promoted.

To most cattle producers only the sharpness and timing of the present adjustment in cattle prices was unexpected. To prevent greater distress we urge the exploration and use of available means to promote clearance of meats in existing trade channels and examination of the adequacy of livestock credit facilities to prevent uneconomic liquidation.

Direct intervention to support the cattle industry is no more acceptable now than were the price controls and regulations, from which we were only recently relieved. Greenwood County cattlemen have confidence in an expanding economy in America and faith in the future of their business.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE W. AICHER,  
Secretary.

#### ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—RELEASE AND RESOLUTIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, during the week of March 23, the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on the St. Lawrence Seaway will hold hearings on the subject of Senate bill 589, providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corp. to construct a part of the St. Lawrence seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security authorizing the corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; and for other purposes, and various substitutes and amendments thereto.

Under the bill, a St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corp. would be established for the purpose of joining with our Canadian good neighbor in coconstruction and cotile to the seaway.

On March 8 I issued a release describing these hearings and urging enactment of the proposed legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the release, together with several resolutions which I have received from Wisconsin, urging the approval of the proposed leg-

islation, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the release and resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY  
SENATOR WILEY SCHEDULES 3 DAYS OF HEARINGS ON ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY LEGISLATION; SCOPE RESTRICTED TO FOUR PHASES; BILL URGED AS SIGNIFICANT FOREIGN-POLICY STEP

During the week of March 23 there will be held 3 days of hearings on St. Lawrence seaway legislation by a Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee, on which I serve as chairman.

I will suggest a subcommittee vote as soon as possible after the conclusion of the hearings in order that the issue may be brought to the full Foreign Relations Committee and promptly forwarded to the Senate floor.

The schedule of the hearings will be:

First day: Members of the Congress and spokesmen from Government agencies.

Second day: Proponents of the varying pieces of legislation, including the Wiley bill S. 589 and amendments and substitutes thereto.

Third day: Opponents of the legislation.

I believe that we can do full justice to this subject in these 3 days, and that we will be rendering the American taxpayer a real service by not attempting to rehash all of the arguments—pro and con—which have been repeated for the last 30 years on this project.

The documentation on the seaway is already so thick—with so many previous printed hearings, reports, studies, memoranda, committee prints—that it would be wasteful to review any but the relatively new phases of the problem.

During recent years when the issue has come up in the Senate, the scope of the hearings has been limited as it will be now.

#### The four phases to be covered

The following are the four phases to which we will address ourselves:

Witnesses desiring to be heard are requested to confine themselves to these four subjects. In addition, individuals who would like to file statements with the committee are most welcome to do so but are urged similarly to confine their statements to these four phases:

1. Desirability: In view of the fact that Canada is ready to proceed immediately with an all-Canadian St. Lawrence seaway, is it desirable, from the standpoint of national security and other considerations for the United States to construct part of the St. Lawrence canals on United States territory, and exercise joint control with Canada?

2. Corporation: What are the problems in financing the construction of the canals on United States territory on a self-liquidating basis through a St. Lawrence seaway development corporation?

3. Upper lake channels: Is it desirable to authorize the deepening of the connecting channels of the Great Lakes to 27 feet, at the present time, as a part of the proposed St. Lawrence, bill or by separate legislation?

4. Power: In view of the current status of the New York-Ontario St. Lawrence Power application, pending before the Federal Power Commission, is it necessary at this time that Congress take any action with respect to the power project?

#### Seaway passage will be healthy index to Malenkov

Speaking purely personally and not as the committee or subcommittee chairman, I believe that at the present moment, when all of the eyes of the world are turned toward Moscow, America could take few more significant actions than to demonstrate her unity with her best neighbor, Canada, by immediately authorizing joint construction of this mighty project.

The St. Lawrence seaway is an instrument for peace and prosperity. This legislation is thus not directed against any nation, but rather for the economic health and well-being of the North American Continent, and to further sound trade with all peoples of the world.

Soviet Russia has been engaged in a tremendous program of canal and hydroelectric construction, and no project could better demonstrate to her people and peoples everywhere that the United States is not blind to the need for similar activity on our own continent.

At the same time, the St. Lawrence seaway will tremendously enhance our defensive potential, as attested by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Completion of the seaway would, therefore, be a sound index to Mr. Malenkov and company that the United States is moving progressively to equip herself invincibly with the means for self-defense against any possible contingency.

Nothing impresses the Soviets more than vigorous action on our part, particularly action showing that we have the vision to plan with our allies for mutual strength. On the other hand, nothing makes the Soviets more contemptuous of us and fills them with more dangerous arrogance than a feeling that the people and leaders of the United States are blind even to their own best interests, i. e., blind to the significance of a project of this nature.

Whereas the St. Lawrence seaway project is vital to our national defense and economic well-being, and will serve to promote the mutual security of the United States and Canada; and

Whereas the seaway project will provide a needed artery for the transportation of iron ore to our Nation's steel-producing centers, and the shipment of grain and agricultural commodities, as well as essential raw materials and industrial products; and Whereas Wisconsin agriculture and industry are dependent upon a healthy steel industry in the Great Lakes area: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the members of the Business and Professional Women's Club of Burlington, Wis., do hereby declare themselves in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway project, and the joint participation of the United States with Canada in the development and control of the seaway; be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to our Senators, ALEXANDER WILEY and JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, and to our Representative, LAWRENCE H. SMITH.

Unanimously adopted March 11, 1953.

Whereas the Beloit Business and Professional Women's Club believes that the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project will open the middle western region of the United States and Canada to world trade, it will provide an efficient and inexpensive route for bringing Labrador ore to middle-western steel mills, it will provide cheap and steady electricity in a region noted for power shortages and high electricity rates, because the project is completely self-liquidating, and because the national-defense need for the water and power is a pressing need for defense industries: Be it

*Resolved*, That we urge our Senators and Representative to favorably support the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project after it has been presented before their respective bodies for study and discussion, and for the final vote on the bill; be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senators ALEXANDER WILEY and JOSEPH MCCARTHY, and to Representative LAWRENCE H. SMITH.

Respectfully submitted,

ANNE UBER,  
Legislative Chairman,  
FEBRUARY 23, 1953.

## REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 1362. A bill for the relief of Rose Martin; without amendment (Rept. No. 68).

## REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. CARLSON, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon, pursuant to law.

## ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 16, 1953, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1188) to amend the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to continue in effect certain of the provisions thereof.

## BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 1320. A bill for the relief of Mordechai Dinewitz;

S. 1321. A bill for the relief of Michajlo Dzieczko;

S. 1322. A bill for the relief of George Papadopoulos; and

S. 1323. A bill for the relief of Lydia L. A. Samraney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE (by request):

S. 1324. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to fix certain licensing and registration fees; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1325. A bill for the relief of Szjena Peison and David Peison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 1326. A bill for the relief of Montchen Thomas Tchou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BRICKER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1327. A bill to require that collectors of customs, United States attorneys, and United States marshals be appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws, and provide for the appointment by the Postmaster General of postmasters at first-, second-, and third-class post offices; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1328. A bill to establish a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1329. A bill to provide for the shipment of surplus food commodities to the people of the Republic of Korea; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1330. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1331. A bill for the relief of Dr. Byron Marcy UnKauf; and

S. 1332. A bill for the relief of Mary Good-year Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1333. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to permit States to enter into agreements with the Administrator to extend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to teachers in the public schools of such States who are covered by retirement systems; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1334. A bill for the relief of the Reverend A. E. Smith;

S. 1335. A bill for the relief of certain Palestinian Arab refugees;

S. 1336. A bill for the relief of certain Palestinian Arab refugees;

S. 1337. A bill for the relief of certain Palestinian Arab refugees;

S. 1338. A bill for the relief of certain Palestinian Arab refugees;

S. 1339. A bill for the relief of certain Palestinian Arab refugees;

S. 1340. A bill for the relief of certain Palestinian Arab refugees;

S. 1341. A bill for the relief of certain Palestinian Arab refugees;

S. 1342. A bill for the relief of certain Palestinian Arab refugees;

S. 1343. A bill for the relief of certain Palestinian Arab refugees;

S. 1344. A bill for the relief of certain Palestinian Arab refugees;

S. 1345. A bill for the relief of certain Palestinian Arab refugees;

S. 1346. A bill for the relief of certain Palestinian Arab refugees; and

S. 1347. A bill for the relief of certain Palestinian Arab refugees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 1348. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, so as to improve the credit services available to farmers seeking to adopt soil- and water-conservation systems of farming contributing toward development of a permanently and abundantly productive American agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1349. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERR:

S. 1350. A bill for the relief of Ralston Edward Harry; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. 1351. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Oscar Ems de Huy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1352. A bill for the relief of Siegfried Rosenzweig; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1353. A bill to amend section 3469 of the Internal Revenue Code to exempt from tax the transportation of persons to and from Mexico, to and from Central America, and to and from the West Indies; and

S. 1354. A bill to provide that service of cadets and midshipmen at the service academies during specified periods shall be considered active military or naval wartime service for the purposes of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1355. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

## MONTCHEN THOMAS TCHOU

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of Montchen Thomas

Tchou. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me pertaining to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1326) for the relief of Montchen Thomas Tchou, introduced by Mr. BRICKER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement by Mr. BRICKER is as follows:

## STATEMENT BY SENATOR BRICKER

The bill would legalize permanent residence in the United States of M. Thomas Tchou, a native of West China. Tchou is a graduate in naval architecture and mechanical engineering of the University of Glasgow, Scotland. Since January of 1952, he has been employed as a naval architect-draftsman in Cleveland.

With the exception of some brief visits out of the country, Tchou has been in the United States continuously since January 1, 1938. During his first years in the United States, Tchou was an official of the Chinese Nationalist Government. He had previously served that government as secretary to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and as a member of Chinese missions in Washington, Berlin, Paris, and London.

Tchou now lives in Cleveland, but owns a home in Yellow Springs, Ohio, where his son Raymond is a student at Antioch College. Tchou's wife, a Scotch woman, has already been granted permanent residence in the United States.

## APPOINTMENT OF CERTAIN OFFICIALS AND POSTMASTERS UNDER CIVIL SERVICE LAWS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to extend the blue ribbon merit system in our Government. It would require collectors of customs, United States attorneys, and United States marshals to be appointed in accordance with the civil service laws. Furthermore, it would eliminate once and for all political patronage in the appointment of postmasters in first-, second-, and third-class post offices. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me relating to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1327) to require that collectors of customs, United States attorneys, and United States marshals be appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws, and provide for the appointment by the Postmaster General of postmasters at first-, second-, and third-class post offices, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

## STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

Members of the Senate will recall that I have been an advocate of the blue-ribbon merit system as an essential step in the development of a clean Government program ever since I have been a Member of the Senate. This accounted for my active support in behalf of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952, eliminating political patronage from

the Bureau of Internal Revenue. I likewise supported the reorganization plans to eliminate political patronage in the remaining agencies of our Government.

The Senate did not see fit to agree with all of those reorganization plans during the 82d Congress. It is my hope that it will agree to enact legislation to carry out the objectives of good and meritorious government. I was for the merit system when the Democrats were the majority party and I remain for the merit system now that the Republicans are in power. There is room for the argument that political patronage is important in a policymaking Government position, but there can be no legitimate excuse for patronage in other agencies of government. The spoils system should be eliminated and my bill will go far to end it.

#### TEMPORARY NATIONAL COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to create a temporary bipartisan National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Members of the Senate will recall that the bill was developed during the 81st Congress by this Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, of which I was chairman. We held extensive hearings and found the testimony unanimous and enthusiastic in support of the establishment of such a Commission.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared relating to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1328) to establish a temporary National Commission of Intergovernmental Relations, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The statement by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

##### STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

Within the past few days, President Eisenhower has met with representatives of our State governments in a serious effort to improve relations between our Federal, State, and local governments. The volume and complexity of those relations have been substantially increased as a result of our defense program. It is, therefore, important that the establishment of a National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations not be delayed and that the Commission be instructed to submit its report, as well as its recommendations as soon as possible.

The Hoover Commission specifically recommended that a Commission be established, not only because Federal-State relations is the cardinal question of our Federal system of government, but also to accomplish its other recommendations in an adequate and orderly manner. The Hoover Commission recommended that the National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations be of a continuing nature. My proposal and the proposal we developed unanimously during the 81st Congress provides that the Commission be temporary so that the Congress has an opportunity to review its work before establishing it on a temporary basis. In my own mind, I have not precluded the temporary Commission becoming a continuing one if that should be desirable, but I hesitate to create a new Government agency to be added to the already large bureaucratic structure of our Government.

The issue of Federal-State-local relations is basic to good government and to democratic government in the United States. A bipartisan Commission can go far toward placing the problems affecting that relationship in proper focus and toward helping to solve many of them. We ought not to delude ourselves into believing, however, that such a Commission can solve all the problems inherent in our Federal system of government. Having been a mayor of rather a large city, I know intimately many of these problems. They arise out of the need for constitutional revision in many of our States, for reapportionment and for the consolidation of many governmental functions on a local and State level. The best way to preserve States rights is to strengthen States' responsibilities. The best way for the States to assume their rightful responsibility is to strengthen their governmental machinery so that they can respond to the popular will and to popular needs. There can be no lasting solution to the problems inherent in our Federal system of government until this governmental reorganization takes place.

In introducing our bill to create a temporary bipartisan Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, I deem it important to face up to the issues realistically. A commission can go far and can make a great contribution but it will provide no panacea. We need boldness, courage, responsibility, and a clear will if the role of our State and local governments is to be strengthened and if our Federal system of government is to serve the needs of our people efficiently and effectively.

#### REVISED BUDGET ESTIMATES

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution requesting the President to transmit to the Congress revised budget estimates. I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18), submitted by Mr. MURRAY, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, as follows:

Whereas the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended, provides for the transmission to the Congress at the beginning of every session of a complete budget, including a complete set of estimated appropriations and expenditures; and

Whereas this procedure has proved to be an indispensable factor in the orderly consideration by the Congress of budgetary and fiscal measures; and

Whereas the only budget thus far transmitted to the Congress is the budget transmitted by the former President on January 9, 1953; and

Whereas revisions in this budget have already been obtained from all departments and agencies by the Director of the Budget, on behalf of the President; and

Whereas the transmission of the revised estimates to the Congress is essential to proper congressional consideration of appropriation measures and of proposals for tax reductions and other revenue measures: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President is hereby requested, in accordance with the established procedures developed under the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended, to transmit to the Congress by April 20, 1953, such revisions in or amendments to, the budget transmitted on January 9, 1953, as he may deem appropriate.*

The statement by Mr. MURRAY is as follows:

##### STATEMENT BY SENATOR MURRAY

One of the most important questions before this Congress is whether or not the budget for the next fiscal year can be balanced.

The established procedure for the orderly consideration of this question by the Congress is the transmission to the Congress by the President of a budget message, recommending a specific amount of appropriations and expenditures and estimating the Government's total revenues.

Unfortunately, the new administration has not presented the Congress with a budget. The only budget before the Congress is the one submitted by President Truman on January 9 of this year, just 11 days before he left office.

Moreover, there is no indication that the new administration is planning to submit a revised budget to the Congress. The only plan thus far announced is the plan described in the New York Times of March 7. According to the New York Times, the Budget Bureau is preparing a series of amendments to the Truman budget. These amendments are to be transmitted separately during the course of April and May.

There is a tremendous difference between a long-drawn-out series of disconnected amendments, on the one hand, and a comprehensive budget proposal, on the other hand. The Congress is entitled to know at an early stage in this session whether or not the administration supports the Truman proposal for expenditures totaling \$78.6 billion.

If the administration is proposing to cut the Truman budget—and many conflicting points of view have been expressed on this matter by White House and congressional spokesmen for the administration—how much will the cut be? Will it be as large as \$9.9 billion, the estimated deficit in the Truman budget, or will it be only a small fraction of this amount?

If the new administration is going to cut, where will these cuts be? How big a cut will be proposed in national defense and international security? How big will be the cut in the field of natural resources? Will there be cuts in agricultural expenditures?

The Congress of the United States and the people of the United States are entitled to a complete and early answer to these questions.

The only way to answer these questions is through the prompt submission of a new budget.

The concurrent resolution, which I have prepared, requests the submission of such a complete budget by April 20 of this year.

Under this resolution, a 3 months' period is provided between the day upon which the new administration took office and the time for transmitting the new budget. This certainly provides an ample opportunity for the administration to determine its budgetary policies—particularly since the new Budget Director began his study of the budget back in November 1952, 2 months before General Eisenhower took office.

#### EXTENSION TO STATE OF ARKANSAS OF PROVISIONS OF ACT RELATING TO CONSERVATION OF WATER RESOURCES—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on February 6, 1953, I introduced the bill (S. 789) to extend the provisions of the act of August 28, 1937, relating to the conservation of water resources in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States, to the State of Arkansas, which would extend the Water Facilities Act,

or the Pope-Jones Act, to the State of Arkansas. The bill was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

I have been advised by the staff of that committee that jurisdiction of the proposed legislation lies in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The program under the act which the bill seeks to amend is administered by the Department of Agriculture, through the Farmers Home Administration, and the original act and the subsequent amendments to it came from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I have notified the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and it is my understanding that he has no objection.

Therefore, I ask that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 789) and that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas? The Chair hears none, and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and it will be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

#### ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Article entitled "A Fair Conduct Code for Congress," written by Senator KEFAUVER and published in the New Republic of March 16, 1953.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Address entitled "The Truth May Keep Us Free," delivered by Senator SYMINGTON before the Philadelphia Bulletin Forum on March 11, 1953.

Editorial entitled "Well Done, Mr. Bowles," published in the New York Times of March 15, 1953.

By Mr. THYE:

Article entitled "Cattlemen Kiss Santa Claus Goodbye," written by Aubrey Graves, and published in the Washington Post of Sunday, March 15, 1953.

Article entitled "Death of John Brandt Ends Life of Great Man," written by W. F. Schilling, and published in the Northfield (Minn.) Independent of March 12, 1953.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

Article entitled "Iowa State's Educational TV," written by Dorothy Thompson and published in the Washington Evening Star of March 10, 1953.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Editorial entitled "A Bit of Sunshine," published in the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of March 13, 1953.

By Mr. BRICKER:

Editorial entitled "Threat to Freedom," from United Evangelical magazine Action.

By Mr. SCHOEPEL:

Editorial entitled "Point 4 Aid to Backward Peoples Needs Rechecking," published in the Saturday Evening Post of recent date.

By Mr. FREAR:

Editorial entitled "What Now?" published in the Wilmington (Del.) Record of March 13, 1953.

By Mr. KERR:

Poem entitled "The Death of Wiley Post and Will Rogers," written by Dewey F. Denison.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

Editorial entitled "Justice for Mr. Burkett," published in the Omaha (Nebr.) Evening World-Herald of February 16, 1953.

Editorial entitled "What Price Morality?" published in the Lodi (Calif.) Times of February 19, 1953.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

Article dealing with Communist teachers as a problem involving both indoctrination and academic freedom, written by Sidney Hook, and published in the March 9, 1953, issue of the New Leader.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

Article entitled "Farm Policy and Economic Policy," written by John D. Clark, published in today's Washington Post.

Article entitled "The Bohlen Nomination," written by Walter Lippmann, and published in today's Washington Post.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

Article entitled "These Days," written by George Sokolsky, published in today's Washington Times-Herald.

Article entitled "Senator McCARRAN Suit and the Public Press," written by Westbrook Pegler, and published in the Washington Times-Herald of March 11, 1953.

By Mr. WELKER:

Editorial entitled "More Gall From England," published in the Idaho Statesman, March 14, 1953.

#### TITLE TO RESOURCES OF SUBMERGED LANDS

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I present and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, a copy of a letter I addressed to His Excellency, Dennis J. Roberts, Governor of Rhode Island, on last March 3, relating to submerged lands legislation presently under consideration by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; also a copy of the reply I received from Governor Roberts, and a copy of the resolution introduced in the Rhode Island General Assembly on Thursday, March 12, which passed the house of representatives unanimously that day.

This official correspondence and this resolution I certainly believe will be of interest to the Members of the Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter, the reply thereto, and the resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 3, 1953.

His Excellency DENNIS J. ROBERTS,  
Governor of the State of Rhode Island,  
Providence, R. I.

DEAR GOVERNOR: There are pending in Congress bills to give California, Louisiana, and Texas the oil, gas, and other mineral resources in submerged lands of the sea off their shores. These resources belong to all the people of the United States, including the people of our State of Rhode Island. They are of vital importance to us and to the whole Nation. It is proposed to give them away without compensation, and if the proposal succeeds, three States will receive vast benefits and profits at the expense of the people of the other 45 States.

The United States was compelled to sue California, Louisiana, and Texas, and it won all three cases. The purpose of the legislation now before Congress is to change the result of the decisions of the Supreme Court, and to give these three States the Nation's known mineral resources in the submerged lands of the sea. Nobody really knows the amount or value of the oil and gas and other minerals in the submerged lands of the seas near the shores of the United States. Estimates vary from several billion to \$40 or \$50

billion. Rhode Island is entitled to a share in the benefits from this great wealth.

The pending bills are drawn so as to make it appear that all of the coastal States are to benefit by the proposed gift. They purport to give all of the coastal States the right, title, and interest of the United States in the marginal sea off their shores. The misleading propaganda, circulated ever since the Supreme Court decided against these States, is to the effect that title to the submerged lands of navigable inland lakes and rivers and harbors is in doubt, and also the State's interest in oysters, clams, and other marine life.

None of these statements has any sound basis. The submerged beds of navigable inland waters are not and never were involved in this matter. There is not and has not been any desire by the United States to interfere with the States' control of marine life in the adjacent waters or in submerged lands of those waters. Moreover, the United States has tried for years to obtain legislation expressly relinquishing forever any claim or right to such products of the sea, or to any filled land or improvements built into the sea. But the representatives of these three States, and their supporters, have never allowed any of such bills to come out of any committee, or to pass in any form, because it suited their purpose to prevent such legislation. The obvious purpose has been to keep it tied to their bills to give them the Nation's oil, gas, and other mineral resources in the submerged lands of the sea.

Some of the representatives of the coastal States may be misled by such tactics but I am not, and I do not believe the people of Rhode Island are. These bills do not give us anything we do not now have or else may not get for the asking, but on the other hand they deprive, and are intended to deprive, the people of Rhode Island of the benefit of their interest in the vast oil, gas, and other mineral resources of the submerged lands of the marginal sea. It should be understood that whatever sums of money are to be realized by these three States from this proposed gift will be taken away from the taxpayers of the other States, including Rhode Island. Money which could be used to prevent Federal taxes from going higher, or to reduce present taxes, will go instead to three States. The taxpayers of Rhode Island will be taxed in the future to make up the revenues it is proposed to give California, Louisiana, and Texas.

Some of these bills, with heavy backing, are even more objectionable. They not only purport to give the States the title to the 3-mile belt always claimed by the United States, but they also extend that belt to what they call historical boundaries, so that some States will get much larger areas in the sea than others. In addition to this discrimination, Texas has introduced a bill under which it would receive 37½ percent of all the proceeds from the oil, gas, and other mineral resources beyond its marginal belt, which it claims to be 10½ miles and all the way to the outermost edge of the Continental Shelf, more than 150 miles from its shore.

I think that you will agree that the people of our State and the people of our Nation ought not to be silent in the face of this attempt to strip the Nation of its oil, gas, and other mineral resources in the sea for the benefit of the people of three States. This would be discriminatory and unfair to Rhode Island and other States.

There is a legal question as to whether the Congress has power to divest the United States of its rights, title, and interest in areas subject to international usage and agreement. The Supreme Court has said that the United States acquired its rights in the marginal sea as an incident of national external sovereignty. It has also said that no State has any rights in the submerged lands of the marginal sea. The question as to whether Congress can take such rights away from the

United States and give them, for all practical purposes, to three States is one that demands final decision by the Nation's highest Court.

Rhode Island has not hesitated in the past to question the power of Congress where legislation seemed detrimental to the best interests of the Nation, and I think it ought to be ready to act again if Congress passes bills of the character I have described in this letter. Rhode Island tested the validity of the prohibition amendment to the Constitution of the United States, in the case reported in 253 U. S. 350. It directed the attorney general of the State to file suit and it appropriated funds for the litigation.

If it meets with your approval, I would suggest that the legislature now be requested to adopt an appropriate resolution, directing the attorney general of the State immediately to begin study of the issues involved, and in the event of the passage of any of these bills substantially in their present form, to institute suit by and on behalf of the State of Rhode Island to have any such legislation declared null and void.

Sincerely yours,

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND  
PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS,  
Providence, March 12, 1953.

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,  
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Upon receipt of your letter of March 3, 1953, relative to certain bills pending in the Congress of the United States, that is, submerged lands, I conferred with the attorney general who advises me that in the event the Rhode Island General Assembly adjourns prior to the enactment of such bills by the Congress, Rhode Island would be powerless to act unless a suitable resolution had been adopted by the legislature of this State. As a result of this conference the attorney general has prepared such legislation for introduction in the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island.

Appreciating that the interest of the people of Rhode Island might subsequently require action by the attorney general of this State such a resolution is deemed advisable.

Sincerely yours,

DENNIS J. ROBERTS,  
Governor.

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND TO TAKE SUCH ACTION AS MAY BE DEEMED ADVISABLE OR NECESSARY TO OBTAIN A FINAL DETERMINATION BY THE COURTS UPON ISSUES AND QUESTIONS INVOLVED IN PROPOSALS PENDING IN CONGRESS CONCERNING RIGHTS, TITLE, AND INTEREST OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE SUBMERGED LANDS OF THE MARGINAL SEA, PARTICULARLY IN THE OIL, GAS, AND OTHER MINERAL RESOURCES OF SUCH AREAS

Whereas bills are pending in the Congress of the United States to divest the people of the United States of their rights, title, and interest in the submerged lands of the marginal sea; and

Whereas the primary purpose of such proposed legislation is to give, without consideration, all the oil, gas, and other mineral resources of the marginal sea to 3 States—California, Louisiana, and Texas—at the expense of the other 45 States; and

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has decided at least four times that such natural resources belong to the United States, and do not and never have belonged to any State; and

Whereas such resources are needed for the defense of the Nation and should be administered and developed for the benefit of all the people of the United States; and

Whereas such a gift would be detrimental to the people and particularly the taxpayers of the State of Rhode Island, who would

be taxed and continue to be taxed in the future to pay for the cost of acquiring needed oil, gas, and other minerals now belonging to the United States but which it is proposed to give to the States off whose shores such resources have been located; and

Whereas the people of Rhode Island are entitled to their fair share of the benefits accruing to all the people of the United States from its rights, title, and interest in the oil, gas, and other mineral resources of the submerged lands of the sea; and

Whereas it is believed that legislation designed to deprive the United States of its rights in the submerged lands of the sea would create unfair and unwarranted discriminations between the States, and would for many reasons, violate the Constitution of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the attorney general of the State of Rhode Island be and he is hereby authorized and directed to begin immediately a study of the legal and equitable issues and principles involved in legislation purporting to divest the United States of its rights, title, and interest in any of the submerged lands of the seas bordering the coasts of the United States, and in the event of the passage of such legislation to institute such suits or proceedings, or to take such other action as may be advisable or necessary, to obtain a final determination by the courts as to the power of Congress to make such enactments; and be it further.

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he is hereby authorized and directed to transmit to the attorney general of the State of Rhode Island a duly certified copy of this resolution.

#### HUNGARIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, the 15th day of March is celebrated throughout the free world as Hungarian Independence Day. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD, following my remarks, the text of a statement which I have prepared for this occasion.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

##### STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES

The 15th day of March is one of the memorable days in the history of mankind's struggle against the forces of tyranny. This day marks the liberation of the Hungarian people from Hapsburg despotism.

As we take note of this significant occasion, the gallant people of Hungary still suffer under the ruthless domination of the Soviet invaders. The Russian conquest of this land, however, cannot erase the memory of the great Hungarian leader, Louis Kossuth. The legacy of freedom which he bequeathed to his people will continue to sustain them until Hungary once again takes her rightful place among the free nations of the world.

On this independence day I hope and pray that Hungary's hour of liberation is near.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, yesterday, March 15, was Hungarian Freedom Day. I send to the desk a statement which I have prepared in commemoration of that day, and ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

##### STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

With Hungary once more enslaved by a foreign power, it is difficult for us to say that we are celebrating Hungarian Freedom Day. It is more appropriate for us to use this occasion to commemorate the many Hungarian patriots who have in the past striven

to attain freedom for Hungary and to dedicate ourselves anew to the ultimate achievement of the goal which all of us so deeply desire: the reestablishment of a free and independent Hungary.

In its long and glorious history, Hungary has had the sad fate of experiencing the rule of many foreign tyrants, but the Hungarian people have seen these tyrants come and go. Through it all it has clung to its own great traditions, repelling the foreign efforts to press it into a different mold. The Hungarian people have thereby won the admiration of the world for their tenaciousness and stubbornness.

I am confident that the fate of the Soviet tyranny that rules Hungary today is not going to be any different from that of its predecessors, even though its brutality and evilness may be more all-pervading than anything that has been experienced previously. The spirit of freedom, the spirit of Louis Kossuth and his associates will live on, in spite of the persecution of such leading citizens as the great Cardinal Mindszenty, in spite of police intimidation, deportations, and mass murder. The time will come again when you will once more recite the words of your national poet, Sandor Petöcsi:

"On your feet, Magyars, \* \* \*  
We shall not be slaves any longer."

#### SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR VETERANS

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, a few days ago the distinguished junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], speaking on the 55th anniversary of the sinking of the battleship *Maine*, gave us a comprehensive and most interesting review of the conditions surrounding the Spanish-American War.

He called our attention to the advancing age of the men of the Spanish-American War. He pointed out that it was the only war in American history that was fought entirely by volunteers.

He reminded us that it was 20 years after the end of the war before the Spanish-American War veteran was granted any benefits whatsoever in recognition of his service and sacrifice.

The Senator from Iowa, as Senators know, served as a sergeant in the Spanish-American War, and I deeply appreciated his gracious reference to me as another veteran of that conflict.

A third Spanish-American War veteran presently holding membership in this body as the able junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], who served in the First Regiment, West Virginia Volunteer Infantry.

The outfit in which I had the honor to serve was the 10th Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry. This organization holds a reunion each year and a careful report of its membership is compiled annually by its recorder, Dan A. Dooley.

The latest report of the 10th Pennsylvania Volunteers was given on February 18, 1953, and was as follows:

Members living, 232; died or killed while in service, 677; present whereabouts unknown, 12; or a total of 921.

The 10th Pennsylvania served in the Philippines in 1898 and 1899 as a part of the old Eighth Army Corps. There were many great outfits serving in the Philippines at that time.

It may be of interest to recall the volunteer units fighting in the Philippines more than half a century ago. They were as follows: Astor Battery, New

York; 1st California; California Heavy Artillery; 1st Colorado; 1st Idaho; 51st Iowa; 20th Kansas; 13th Minnesota; 1st Montana; 1st Nebraska; Nevada Cavalry; 1st North Dakota; 2d Oregon; 10th Pennsylvania; 1st South Dakota; 1st Tennessee; Utah Light Artillery; 1st Washington; and 1st Wyoming.

With the exception of the Astor Battery, they all came from the National Guard and all were volunteers. In addition, as is always the case, several fine organizations of the Regular Army served in the Philippines.

Recorder Dooley's report shows that all the field and staff officers and the noncommissioned staff of the 10th Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry have died except two. The survivors are Maj. Everhart Bierer, who was born November 12, 1865, and Principal Musician Frank M. Keffer, who was born October 1, 1875.

A Company's oldest living veteran is William H. McKain, who was born May 31, 1868.

B Company's oldest living veteran is Capt. Harry J. Watson, who was born October 11, 1868.

C Company's oldest living veteran is John R. Barnes, who was born February 28, 1866.

D Company's oldest living veteran is Oliver N. Morrison, who was born August 26, 1868.

E Company's oldest living veteran is James R. Rischeberger, who was born June 7, 1868.

H Company's oldest living veteran is Charles L. Stewart, who was born November 29, 1865.

I Company's oldest living veteran is Andrew Banks, who was born March 21, 1866.

K Company's oldest living veteran is Frank Wisecarver, who was born October 4, 1869.

The Spanish-American War veterans are rapidly answering the last roll call.

#### AN IRISH BLESSING

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, in view of the fact that tomorrow is the birthday anniversary of the patron saint of Ireland, St. Patrick, and inasmuch as we are observing the day today by wearing green carnations in our lapels, I should like to read a blessing which I have received through the mail. I received it not from one of my own constituents but from a person in Pennsylvania. I believe it is well worth reading. It is a real Irish blessing and reads:

May the blessing of light be on you—light without and light within.

May the blessed sunlight shine on you and warm your heart till it glows like a great peat fire, so that the stranger may come and warm himself at it and also a friend.

And may the light shine out of the 2 eyes of you, like a candle set in 2 windows of a house, bidding the wanderer to come in out of the storm.

And may the blessing of the rain be on you—the soft sweet rain. May it fall upon your spirit so that all the little flowers may spring up and shed their sweetness on the air, and may the blessing of the great rains be on you, may they beat upon your spirit and wash it fair and clean, and leave there many a shining pool where the blue of heaven shines and sometimes a star.

XCIX—124

And may the blessing of the earth be on you—the great round earth; may you ever have a kindly greeting for them you pass as you're going along the roads. May the earth be soft under you when you rest out upon it, tired at the end of a day, and may it rest easy over you when at the last you lay out under it; may it rest so lightly over you that your soul may be off from under it quickly, and up and off and on its way to God.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Goldwater	McCarran
Anderson	Gore	McCarthy
Barrett	Green	McClellan
Beall	Hayden	Millikin
Bricke	Hendrickson	Monroney
Bridges	Hennings	Mundt
Bush	Hickenlooper	Murray
Butler, Md.	Hill	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Payne
Byrd	Holland	Potter
Carlson	Humphrey	Purcell
Case	Ives	Robertson
Chavez	Jackson	Schoeppel
Clements	Jenner	Smathers
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. C.
Dirksen	Kefauver	Sparkman
Douglas	Kerr	Stennis
Duff	Kilgore	Symington
Dworshak	Knowland	Taft
Eastland	Kuchel	Thye
Ellender	Langer	Watkins
Ferguson	Lehman	Welker
Flanders	Long	Wiley
Frear	Magnuson	Williams
Fulbright	Malone	Young
George	Mansfield	
Gillette	Martin	

Mr. TAFT. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] was appointed as a member of the committee upon the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the late Honorable Joseph R. Bryson, a Representative from the State of South Carolina, and is, therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

#### THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The calendar, under rule VIII, is now in order. The clerk will proceed to state the measures on the calendar.

#### BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 242) to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo., was announced as first in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 24) to permit judicial review of decisions of Government contracting officers involving questions of fact arising under Government contracts in cases other than those in which fraud is alleged was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 56) for the relief of Erich Anton Helfert was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 59) for the relief of Felix Kortschak was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 152) for the relief of Fred P. Hines was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 484) for the relief of J. Don Alexander was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 101) for the relief of Phed Vosniacos was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Michigan is not present on the floor. I had something in mind in connection with the debate on the calendar last week. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 102) for the relief of Francesco Cracchiolo was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 153) for the relief of Wilhelm Engelbert was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

#### SOCORRO GERONA DE CASTRO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 173) for the relief of Socorro Gerona de Castro, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "fee", to strike out "and head tax", so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws,*

Socorro Gerona de Castro shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### SISTER ODILIA, ALSO KNOWN AS MARIA HUTTER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 255) for the relief of Sister Odilia, also known as Maria Hutter, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 7, after the word "fee", to strike out "and head tax", so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Sister Odilia, also known as Maria Hutter, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### FREE POSTAGE FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES

The bill (H. R. 2466) to amend the act of July 12, 1950 (ch. 460, 64 Stat. 336), as amended, which authorizes free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States in specific areas was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### CONTINUATION OF EFFECTIVENESS OF MISSING PERSONS ACT

The bill (S. 1229) to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act as amended and extended, until July 1, 1954, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, while the bill is a very meritorious one, it appears to me that its provisions may go too far. The Department of Defense is cognizant of the fact that need for permanent legislation exists, and is consequently making a study of the problem. However, the committee report does not indicate that the Committee on Armed Services is making the study. As an illustration of what the bill provides, I have made inquiry relative to its provisions, to which I have received the information that for the first 6 months of 1952 the bill, if enacted, would cost \$9,607,000. I under-

stand that 11,000 persons are still carried under the category of missing.

I do not know what remedial action is needed, but it seems to me that the Committee on Armed Services and the Senate should give very careful consideration to the subject. I was hoping that the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services would be on the floor this morning.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I should like to say that I am handling the bill for the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. I hope the Senator from Tennessee will not object to the consideration of the bill at this time, because it merely extends the provision of the existing law until—

Mr. GORE. To July 1, 1954.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. I was wondering whether we could agree to extend its provisions until December 31, 1953. Such an extension would permit the Defense Department and the committees of the two Houses of Congress to make a study of the subject in order to deal in a permanent manner with the problem. Would the Senator from New Jersey agree to such an amendment?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The difficulty about it is that Congress would not be in session when the act expired. If the war in Korea should continue beyond that date many persons would be denied the facilities which this bill provides.

Mr. GORE. The magnitude of the problem has already been indicated and the need for permanent legislation is certified by both the committee report and the Defense Department. Would the Senator from New Jersey be agreeable to an amendment extending the provisions of the act until February 1, 1954?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The Senator from New Jersey would accept such an amendment, and I am sure that the Committee on Armed Services would also agree to accept it.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I withhold my objection and offer such an amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 24, it is proposed to strike out the date "July 1, 1954," and to insert in lieu thereof the date "February 1, 1954."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, on page 2, line 8, I ask that the word "iterned" be corrected to read "interned."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement in explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### STATEMENT ON SENATE BILL 1229

This bill will do two things. First, it will extend to July 1, 1954, the Missing Persons Act. This law presently expires on April 1 of this year. Second, the bill incorporates in the basic act certain language changes contained in Public Law 450, 82d Congress, which extended the Missing Persons Act from July 3, 1952, to April 1, 1953.

A word with respect to the background of the law. The Missing Persons Act was passed in 1942 and remained in effect until 1947. It was revived by the Selective Service Act of 1948 and has been extended by various acts until April 1.

Broadly speaking, the Missing Persons Act provides that the heads of the executive departments may continue to credit the pay accounts, and make, continue, or modify allotments to dependents of service personnel and civilians who are in a missing status. The largest group of people who are presently in the missing category are, of course, service people who have been either captured or are missing in Korea.

By being able to credit the soldier's pay account, a Department may protect a variety of financial interests of the soldier, such as paying his commercial insurance premiums while he is in a missing status.

With respect to allotments, the Departments, in a sense, assume the guardianship for the dependents of the soldier, by being permitted to alter the amount of the allotments paid the dependents of the missing soldier.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1229) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Missing Persons Act (ch. 166, secs. 1-12, 14, and 15; 56 Stat. 143-147), as amended (ch. 828, 56 Stat. 1092-1093; ch. 371, 58 Stat. 679-682; ch. 70, 61 Stat. 96; ch. 356, 65 Stat. 207), as extended by section 4 (e) of the act of June 24, 1948 (62 Stat. 608), and as it read before the enactment of Public Laws 313 and 450, 82d Congress, is further amended as follows:

(a) Section 2 (58 Stat. 679) is amended by deleting "interned in a neutral country, captured by an enemy" and inserting in lieu thereof "interned in a foreign country, captured by a hostile force."

(b) Section 6 (56 Stat. 145) is amended by deleting "in the hands of an enemy or is interned in a neutral country" and inserting in lieu thereof "in the hands of a hostile force or is interned in a foreign country."

(c) Section 9 (58 Stat. 681) is amended by deleting "in the lands of an enemy" and inserting in lieu thereof "in the hands of a hostile force" and by deleting "such enemy" and inserting in lieu thereof "such hostile force."

(d) Section 12 (65 Stat. 207) is amended by deleting "interned in a neutral country, or captured by the enemy" and inserting in lieu thereof "interned in a foreign country, or captured by a hostile force."

(e) Section 14 (56 Stat. 147) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 14. The provisions of this act applicable to persons captured by a hostile force shall also apply to any person beleaguered or besieged by a hostile force."

(f) Section 15 (56 Stat. 147, 1093) is amended by deleting everything following the words "and shall remain in effect until" and inserting in lieu thereof "February 1, 1954."

Sec. 2. Section 1 (a) (7) of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act (ch. 570, 66 Stat.

331) is repealed without effect upon rights accrued, liabilities incurred, or actions taken thereunder.

#### RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 86) authorizing expenditures for hearings and investigations by the Committee on Armed Services was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wonder whether we could have an explanation as to how much money is involved and for what purpose the money would be used.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I object to the consideration of the resolution at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The resolution will be passed over.

#### INSTALLATION OF STATUE OF DR. MARCUS WHITMAN IN STATUARY HALL

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 64) authorizing the Washington State Whitman Statue Committee to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of the late Dr. Marcus Whitman, the holding of ceremonies, and permanent location in Statuary Hall was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the last measure and report in my file is Calendar No. 77, Senate Resolution 86. I do not believe the Senate should take up any measure beyond Calendar No. 77, or any measure which is not contained in our files. Therefore, I ask that the next four measures on the calendar be passed over.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Order No. 78 covers a noncontroversial concurrent resolution which is of great importance to the people of the State of Washington. We are somewhat pressed for time in connection with it, because of the necessity of making arrangements for the installation of the statue and the ceremony in connection with it. I wonder whether it could not be disposed of at this time.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as a matter of principle I believe, on the call of the calendar, the Senate should not pass bills or agree to resolutions which are not contained in the bill file on our desks. Copies of measures should be available to Senators, so that they may read and study them, before they are disposed of. That is the only basis for my objection.

This particular resolution is, I believe, entirely noncontroversial, and I would have no objection to having it considered and disposed of at this time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, this is the concurrent resolution authorizing the location in Statuary Hall of a statue of the late Dr. Marcus Whitman.

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 64) was considered and agreed to.

#### RESOLUTION AND BILLS PASSED OVER

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I now ask that the next three measures on the calendar, namely Senate Resolution No. 57, Calendar No. 79; Senate bill 1110, Calendar No. 80; and Senate bill 1078, Calendar No. 81, be passed over, for the reason that reports on those measures are not in our calendar files.

I wish to say to the proponents of those measures that if they wish to have them taken up on Wednesday, I shall be glad to move to have them considered at that time.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I believe that reports on those bills are in my calendar file.

Mr. TAFT. They are not in mine, and I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been made, the resolution and bills referred to will be passed over.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of the Senate proceedings.)

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CARLSON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Philip Young, of New York, to be a Civil Service Commissioner.

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Anthony Julian, of Massachusetts, to be United States attorney for the district of Massachusetts, vice George F. Garrity, term expiring;

Robert Henry Beaudreau, of Massachusetts, to be United States marshal for the district of Massachusetts, vice Arthur J. B. Cartier, removed; and

Enard Erickson, of Minnesota, to be United States marshal for the district of Minnesota, vice John J. McGowan, term expired.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

#### NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Arthur F. Burns, of New York, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

Mr. TAFT. I ask that the nomination be passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be passed over.

#### GOVERNOR OF THE TERRITORY OF ALASKA

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of B. Frank Heintzleman, of Alaska, to be Governor of the Territory of Alaska.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I shall speak only briefly, but I could not refrain from expressing my feelings about an old friend of mine, Frank Heintzleman, who now has been nominated by the new administration to be Governor of Alaska.

Mr. Heintzleman has had a long and distinguished career in Alaska, having pioneered on many of the war-service projects there. He is well known to most Alaskans. In fact, he himself is almost an Alaskan—not by birth, but by having lived and worked in the Territory for many years.

Just the other day I sent him a telegram in which I said, "If we have to have a Republican as Governor of Alaska, I know of no better man than Frank Heintzleman."

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. I wish to say to my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Washington, that I, too, know Frank Heintzleman. I regard him as a great man and an able man. It is my opinion that the Territory of Alaska will have taken rapid strides toward statehood when the nomination of such a distinguished public servant to be Governor shall have been confirmed. I congratulate the Senate on the action it is about to take in confirming the nomination.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I wish to add a word or two regarding the nomination of Frank Heintzleman to be Governor of Alaska.

It was my privilege to meet him in connection with Forest Service activities. I am convinced that he is a man who has sound ideas for the constructive development of the Territory of Alaska.

I have had correspondence with numerous persons in the Territory of Alaska who have spoken with a great deal of pride of Mr. Heintzleman's work. I feel sure that this appointment will be well received there.

Some reference has been made to Mr. Heintzleman's political affiliation. Personally, I was not aware of his political affiliation, but I have been under the impression that he was identified with the new developments there and would perform constructive service.

I was most happy to see the nomination made, and it is a pleasure to join with my colleagues in commending the appointment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of B. Frank Heintzleman, of Alaska, to be Governor of the Territory of Alaska?

The nomination was confirmed.

## NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. Ralph Julian Canine, United States Army, to be Director of the National Security Agency.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

## THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, these are routine nominations, and are reported unanimously by the Armed Services Committee. I ask that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc.

## THE AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, these nominations likewise are routine. On behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, who today is absent from the Senate on official business, I request that the nomination of Brig. Gen. Edward Higgins White, 238A, which appears on page 5 and also on page 6, of the Executive Calendar, Calendar No. 95, Message No. 148, be passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination referred to will be passed over.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I ask that the other nominations in the Air Force be immediately confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the remaining nominations of the Air Force are confirmed en bloc.

## THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, on my own behalf, I ask that the nomination of Rear Adm. Henry C. Bruton, on page 9 of the Executive Calendar, Calendar No. 97, Message No. 85, be passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination referred to will be passed over.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I ask the Senate to confirm the remaining nominations in the Navy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy, with the exception of the one passed over, are confirmed, including the routine nominations reported and lying on the desk, but not printed.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. These are all routine nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the nominations confirmed.

Mr. TAFT. I understand that the Senate has confirmed the nominations which have lain on the desk since the last call of the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

## THE NEEDS OF OUR NATION'S SCHOOLS

Mr. KNOWLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, last week Senators were furnished with an advance copy of an exceptionally valuable report published by the Office of Education of the Federal Security Agency. Inasmuch as the report was released to the public as of yesterday, March 15, I wish to take a few minutes to comment on it and to call the attention of the Senate to some of the more important statements contained in it.

This report is worthy of the attention of every Senator who is concerned about the conditions prevailing in our Nation's educational system.

It is to be noted that while the report was prepared last year by the Commissioner of Education, for transmittal to the former Federal Security Administrator, it is now published during the tenure of office of that gracious lady from Texas, Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, who is currently presiding over the Federal Security Agency, of which the Office of Education is a part.

In passing, let me say that in reading the provisions of the Reorganization Plan No. 1 I was pleased to learn that Mrs. Hobby will become the first Cabinet member to hold the title of Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare if this plan is approved and if the new department thereby is created. The people of Texas will, I am sure, be highly gratified at the honor that is thus bestowed on one of their eminent fellow citizens.

In her position as Administrator of the Agency which publishes this report, as well as in her position as Secretary-to-be of the proposed Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mrs. Hobby will be intensely interested in the problem of how the Federal Government can help in improving our Nation's school system—a problem, of course, which affects not 1, 2, or 3 of our States, but all 48 of them. This report will, I know, serve as a useful guide to all who are trying to aid our schools.

In making public the report at this time, Mrs. Hobby's agency has performed an especially useful service. While its contents would merit our closest study at any time, the fact that it has been released just prior to the approaching debate on disposition of revenues from the offshore oil deposits gives it a particular timeliness and an immediate utility in Congress.

The question of how the Federal Government shall join with the locally controlled schools of the 48 States in a common effort to meet the needs of our school system will, of course, be one of the major issues of debate here in the Senate when the submerged lands bill comes before us.

While I have no intention of discussing that momentous question until the bill has been reported by the committee now considering it, I do believe it will be helpful to place in the RECORD at this time some of the facts gathered by the Office of Education and made available to us by the Federal Security Administrator about the needs of our school system this year and in the years ahead. As the report itself states with regard to the problems of education today:

They are national problems in that they extend beyond the borders of any one State, or any group of States. They are national problems in that they are beyond the resources of any one State, or group of States. They are national problems in that they require national solutions.

Mr. President, let me cite a few of the striking facts set forth in this report. These are facts which every Senator will want to have in mind when the time comes to decide how the revenues from the production of oil and natural gas in the submerged lands off certain of our coasts are to be allocated and expended.

## THE NEED FOR SCHOOL HOUSING

On page 7, the report has this to say about the need for school housing:

One of the most serious situations existing in the Nation today is the shortage of schools \* \* \* To provide adequate classrooms and auxiliary facilities such as gymnasiums and auditoriums for all the children expected to be enrolled in the public schools in the fall of 1952 would require an expenditure of over \$10 billion.

I stop here to note that this was the figure estimated as of last fall, whereas, of course, our school population continues to increase at a rapid rate. The estimated costs of adequate classrooms and other school facilities will be even higher this coming fall.

Continuing, on page 8 of the report, I read:

Moreover, many of the school plants now actually in use do not meet acceptable standards of fire safety; 40 percent of the school buildings are more than 30 years old and 16 percent are more than 50 years old.

Mr. President, these are shocking figures. Two out of every five of our present school buildings are over 30 years old; and the fact that even a few, let alone many, as the report states, are fire traps, is a crime against our children. Farther along on the same page, the report says:

If it were possible to provide adequate school housing for all the Nation's school children this year, \$10 billion would be needed. Yet a conservative estimate by those reporting for the States surveyed indicates that only about half the necessary funds could be provided by the States and local communities through the maximum utilization of bonding capacities. Some form of Federal assistance is imperative if the children of the Nation, regardless of where they live, are to have the advantages even of the basic education which Americans have traditionally considered their birthright.

There is another statement to reflect on, Mr. President. Instead of our educational facilities growing steadily better, particularly in a period of widespread prosperity and full employment, they are getting worse and less adequate—so bad, in fact, that the question can be raised whether our children can

continue to receive even a basic education, let alone anything higher. Congress cannot and dare not ignore this danger much longer.

#### THE NEED FOR MORE TEACHERS

On pages 9 and 10 of the report, we find the following facts concerning the need for more teachers:

From now on, until at least 1957 or 1958, each autumn will find hundreds of thousands of additional children waiting before the school doors of the United States. \* \* \*

Thus, with the lower grades already crowded to the bursting point, the continued high birth rate will engulf an additional higher grade each year. \* \* \*

It is estimated that the need for additional teachers in our schools for the year 1952-53 will be at least 160,000 teachers. \* \* \*

To meet this need our teacher-training institutions have this year graduated only 106,000 teachers, 96,000 at the A. B. level, and 10,000 below degree level yet meeting certification requirements of some of the States.

Continuing to quote from the report:

In a few years the teacher shortage now so acute in the elementary schools will extend to our high schools. The present apparent oversupply of teachers in some fields in the high schools is distinctly a temporary phenomenon which will quickly change to a shortage as the present large population in the lower age groups advances upward in the school system.

And what does the report say about the reasons for this disastrous shortage of teachers? On page 11 we find one of the basic causes listed: Inadequate compensation. I read from the report:

Salaries of teachers have always been low compared to other occupations requiring education beyond the high school. In recent years, however, while the educational requirements for teaching have risen, the salaries of teachers as compared with those in most other professions and vocations with less exacting requirements have declined even further. In many States and communities salaries compare unfavorably with incomes in occupations requiring little or no formal education beyond the elementary grades.

I shall not quote further from this annual report of the Office of Education at this time, Mr. President, although I expect to have occasion to refer to it again at a later date, and perhaps to read from it at greater length. The few sentences I have cited today are sufficient, I believe, to indicate the scope of the needs of our schools and to suggest how essential it is for the Federal Government to join the 48 States in a powerful attack on the problem.

#### AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, Sunday, in Moscow, Prime Minister Georgi Malenkov told the Supreme Soviet there are no issues that cannot be settled peacefully. Deeds, rather than words, would be more impressive.

The free world will not forget that there was a peace meeting going on in the Communist world when the North Koreans started their aggressive war against the Republic of Korea.

There are certain acts the Soviet Union could cause to be done that would indicate good faith:

First. Have the American correspondent Oatis freed from the Czechoslovak prison.

Second. Have Hungary return the American Air Force plane it holds.

Third. Have Czechoslovakia give immediate compensation for the Air Force plane it shot down.

Fourth. Have the Soviet Union compensate—insofar as compensation is possible for the loss of human life—for the American and British airmen and planes shot down by Soviet planes.

Fifth. Announce that forthwith the Soviet Union would abide by the United Nations action declaring North Korea and Communist China the aggressors and in conformity with those resolutions withdraw moral and material aid to the aggressors.

Without a demonstration that this latest speech is not merely more Communist propaganda, while their plans for world conquest go on, there can hardly be any confidence in Sunday's speech.

We have always known that agreements could be entered into with dictatorships such as the Nazi and Soviet Governments providing they were of the Munich or Yalta variety. On such a basis we could not hope to maintain a free world of freemen.

The United States of America and the free world must soon determine if the United Nations is to be an effective organization for collective security and the preservation of peace with honor, or if it is to be an international debating society that plays no adequate part in meeting the challenge to human freedom facing the world today.

On the 25th day of June 1950, the North Korean Communist forces committed aggression against the Republic of Korea. On June 25 the United Nations, through its Security Council, passed a resolution which I ask to have printed at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### THE FIRST UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION—JUNE 25, 1950

(Resolution concerning the complaint of aggression upon the Republic of Korea, adopted at the 473d meeting of the Security Council on June 25, 1950.)

The Security Council, Recalling the finding of the General Assembly in its resolution of 21 October 1949 that the Government of the Republic of Korea is a lawfully established government "having effective control and jurisdiction over that part of Korea where the United Nations Temporary Commission on Korea was able to observe and consult and in which the great majority of the people of Korea reside; and that this Government is based on elections which were a valid expression of the free will of the electorate of that part of Korea and which were observed by the Temporary Commission; and that this is the only such Government in Korea";

Mindful of the concern expressed by the General Assembly in its resolutions of 12 December 1948 and 21 October 1949 of the consequences which might follow unless member states refrained from acts derogatory to the results sought to be achieved by the United Nations in bringing about the complete independence and unity of Korea; and the concern expressed that the situation described by the United Nations Commission

on Korea in its report menaces the safety and well-being of the Republic of Korea and of the people of Korea and might lead to open military conflict there;

Noting with grave concern the armed attack upon the Republic of Korea by forces from North Korea,

Determines that this action constitutes a breach of the peace,

I. Calls for the immediate cessation of hostilities; and

Calls upon the authorities of North Korea to withdraw forthwith their armed forces to the 38th parallel;

II. Requests the United Nations Commission on Korea

(a) To communicate its fully considered recommendations on the situation with the least possible delay;

(b) To observe the withdrawal of the North Korean forces to the 38th parallel; and

(c) To keep the Security Council informed on the execution of this resolution;

III. Calls upon all Members to render every assistance to the United Nations in the execution of this resolution and to refrain from giving assistance to the North Korean authorities.

(Voting for the resolution: China, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, France, India, Norway, United Kingdom, United States. Abstention: Yugoslavia. Absent: Soviet Union, the Soviet Delegate having boycotted meetings of the Council since January 10, 1950.)

Mr. KNOWLAND. This resolution called for the immediate cessation of hostilities and for the authorities of North Korea to withdraw forthwith their armed forces. It also called upon all members to render every assistance to the United Nations in support of the resolution and to refrain from giving assistance to the North Korean authorities.

Two years and eight months have passed, and these facts must be apparent to every person who is willing to honestly face them:

First. The North Korean Communists have ignored the United Nations resolution and deliberately violated its provisions.

Second. The Communist Chinese regime has ignored the resolution and has deliberately violated its provisions.

Third. The Soviet Union, a member of the Security Council and of the United Nations, has ignored the resolution and has deliberately violated its provisions.

On June 27, 1950, the United Nations Security Council passed another resolution, a copy of which I ask to have printed in full at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### THE SECOND UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION—JUNE 27, 1950

(Resolution concerning the complaint of aggression upon the Republic of Korea, adopted at the 474th meeting of the Security Council, on June 27, 1950.)

The Security Council, Having determined that the armed attack upon the Republic of Korea by forces from North Korea constitutes a breach of the peace,

Having called for an immediate cessation of hostilities, and

Having called upon the authorities of North Korea to withdraw forthwith their armed forces to the 38th parallel, and

Having noted from the report of the United Nations Commission for Korea that

the authorities in North Korea having neither ceased hostilities nor withdrawn their armed forces to the 38th parallel and that urgent military measures are required to restore international peace and security, and

Having noted the appeal from the Republic of Korea to the United Nations for immediate and effective steps to secure peace and security,

Recommends that the members of the United Nations furnish such assistance to the Republic of Korea as may be necessary to repel the armed attack and to restore international peace and security in the area.

(Voting for the resolution: United States, United Kingdom, France, China, Norway, Ecuador, and Cuba. Voting against: Yugoslavia. Abstention: Egypt, India (2 days later India accepted the resolution). Absent: Soviet Union.)

Mr. KNOWLAND. In this second resolution the recommendation was made that the members of the United Nations furnish such assistance to the Republic of Korea as may be necessary to repel the armed attack and to restore international peace and security in the area.

More than 2 years and 8 months later, of the 60 members of the United Nations only 17 of them have contributed forces to resist the aggression, and all 17 of them are now contributing less than 35,000 men.

The United States of America alone is contributing more than 350,000 and the Republic of Korea more than 400,000.

This means that the United Nations itself has failed to take effective collective security action and has, in fact, only given token support to the request of its own Security Council.

No long speeches in the headquarters of the United Nations in New York and no excuses in the foreign ministries of the world can cover up the fact that the support of the United Nations members outside the United States represents only 10 percent of the forces contributed by this Nation alone and only 5 percent of the combined contribution of the United States of America and the Republic of Korea.

For the most part, the United Nations membership responded as did the townspeople in the motion picture *High Noon*. They were glad to have a marshal with the courage to risk his life to preserve order and to destroy lawlessness in the form of an armed gunman, but when greatly outnumbered he asked the townspeople to respond by becoming a posse for the preservation of law and order, they gave lame excuses as to why they could not take the risks involved. At the end of the picture the marshal did the job which had to be done, but in righteous indignation when the job had been accomplished, he threw his badge to the street and left the group that had not had the courage to fight for decency and the preservation of law and order. It might be well if a special showing of the film could be arranged for the delegates to the United Nations.

On October 7, 1950, the General Assembly adopted a resolution calling for the unification and independence of Korea. I ask to have this resolution printed at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Document 9 (UN doc. A/1435)]

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, OCTOBER 7, 1950

The General Assembly,

Having regard to its resolutions of November 14, 1947, of December 12, 1948 and of October 21, 1949,

Having received and considered the report of the United Nations Commission on Korea, Mindful of the fact that the objectives set forth in the resolutions referred to above have not been fully accomplished and, in particular, that the unification of Korea has not yet been achieved, and that an attempt has been made by an armed attack from North Korea to extinguish by force the Government of the Republic of Korea,

Recalling the General Assembly declaration of December 12, 1948, that there has been established a lawful government (the Government of the Republic of Korea) having effective control and jurisdiction over that part of Korea where the United Nations Temporary Commission on Korea was able to observe and consult and in which the great majority of the people of Korea reside; that this Government is based on elections which were a valid expression of the free will of the electorate of that part of Korea and which were observed by the Temporary Commission; and that this is the only such Government in Korea,

Having in mind that United Nations armed forces are at present operating in Korea in accordance with the recommendations of the Security Council of June 27, 1950, subsequent to its resolution of June 25, 1950, that Members of the United Nations furnish such assistance to the Republic of Korea as may be necessary to repel the armed attack and to restore international peace and security in the area,

Recalling that the essential objective of the resolutions of the General Assembly referred to above was the establishment of a unified, independent and democratic government of Korea,

1. Recommends that

(a) All appropriate steps be taken to insure conditions of stability throughout Korea;

(b) All constituent acts be taken, including the holding of elections, under the auspices of the United Nations, for the establishment of a unified, independent and democratic government in the sovereign state of Korea;

(c) All sections and representative bodies of the population of Korea, South and North, be invited to cooperate with the organs of the United Nations in the restoration of peace, in the holding of elections and in the establishment of a unified government;

(d) United Nations forces should not remain in any part of Korea otherwise than so far as necessary for achieving the objectives specified in subparagraphs (a) and (b) above;

(e) All necessary measures be taken to accomplish the economic rehabilitation of Korea;

2. Resolves that—

(a) A Commission consisting of Australia, Chile, Netherlands, Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand and Turkey, to be known as the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, be established to (i) assume the functions hitherto exercised by the present United Nations Commission in Korea; (ii) represent the United Nations in bringing about the establishment of a unified, independent and democratic government of all Korea; (iii) exercise such responsibilities in connection with relief and rehabilitation in Korea as may be determined by the General Assembly after receiving the recommendations of

the Economic and Social Council. The United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea should proceed to Korea and begin to carry out its functions as soon as possible.

(b) Pending the arrival in Korea of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, the Governments of the states represented on the Commission should form an interim committee composed of representatives meeting at the seat of the United Nations to consult with and advise the United Nations United Command in the light of the above recommendations; the interim committee should begin to function immediately upon the approval of the present resolution by the General Assembly;

(c) The Commission shall render a report to the next regular session of the General Assembly and to any prior special session which might be called to consider the subject matter of the present resolution, and shall render such interim reports as it may deem appropriate to the Secretary-General for transmission to members;

The General Assembly furthermore,

Mindful of the fact that at the end of the present hostilities the task of rehabilitating the Korean economy will be of great magnitude,

3. Requests the Economic and Social Council, in consultation with the specialized agencies, to develop plans for relief and rehabilitation on the termination of hostilities and to report to the General Assembly within 3 weeks of the adoption of the present resolution by the General Assembly;

4. Also recommends the Economic and Social Council to expedite the study of long-term measures to promote the economic development and social progress of Korea, and meanwhile to draw the attention of the authorities which decide requests for technical assistance to the urgent and special necessity of affording such assistance to Korea;

5. Expresses its appreciation of the services rendered by the members of the United Nations Commission on Korea in the performance of their important and difficult task;

6. Requests the Secretary-General to provide the Commission with adequate staff and facilities, including technical advisers as required; and authorizes the Secretary-General to pay the expenses and per diem of a representative and alternate from each of the states members of the commission.

Mr. KNOWLAND. This resolution, like the others, contained brave words which made little impression upon the Communists of North Korea, Communist China or the Soviet Union.

On February 1, 1951, the General Assembly of the United Nations passed a resolution naming the Peiping Chinese Communist regime as an aggressor in Korea. I ask that this resolution be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION NAMING THE PEIPING REGIME AS AN AGGRESSOR IN KOREA, ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, FEBRUARY 1, 1951

The General Assembly,

Noting that the Security Council, because of lack of unanimity of the permanent members, has failed to exercise its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security in regard to Chinese Communist intervention in Korea.

Noting that the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China has not accepted United Nations proposals to

bring about a cessation of hostilities in Korea with a view to peaceful settlement, and that its armed forces continue their invasion of Korea and their large-scale attacks upon United Nations forces there.

1. Finds that the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, by giving direct aid and assistance to those who were already committing aggression in Korea and by engaging in hostilities against the United Nations forces there, has itself engaged in aggression in Korea;

2. Calls upon the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China to cause its forces and nationals in Korea to cease hostilities against the United Nations forces and to withdraw from Korea;

3. Affirms the determination of the United Nations to continue its action in Korea to meet the aggression;

4. Calls upon all states and authorities to continue to lend every assistance to the United Nations action in Korea;

5. Calls upon all states and authorities to refrain from giving any assistance to the aggressors in Korea;

6. Requests a committee composed of the members of the Collective Measures Committee as a matter of urgency to consider additional measures to be employed to meet this aggression and to report thereon to the General Assembly, it being understood that the Committee is authorized to defer its report if the Good Offices Committee referred to in the following paragraph reports satisfactory progress in its efforts;

7. Affirms that it continues to be the policy of the United Nations to bring about a cessation of hostilities in Korea and the achievement of United Nations objectives in Korea by peaceful means, and requests the President of the General Assembly to designate forthwith two persons who would meet with him at any suitable opportunity to use their good offices to this end.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it took approximately 3 months after the Chinese aggression for the United Nations to muster up its courage to face the facts.

Even this resolution was not passed by the United Nations until the House of Representatives on January 19, 1951, and the Senate on January 23 had adopted the following resolutions:

#### HOUSE RESOLUTIONS

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the United Nations should immediately act and declare the Chinese Communist authorities aggressor in Korea.

#### SENATE RESOLUTIONS

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that the United Nations should immediately declare Communist China an aggressor in Korea.

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Communist Chinese Government should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations as the representative of China.

Again in brave words the United Nations resolution called upon all states and authorities to continue to lend every assistance to the United Nations action in Korea and to refrain from giving any assistance to the aggressors in Korea. This resolution, like the previous ones, was ignored and violated by the North Korean Communists, the Communist Chinese, and by the Soviet Union, which then, as now, was a member of the Security Council and a charter member of the United Nations.

How can there be any justification for the town arsonist to be continued as a member of the local fire department or for the gangster to have access to the deliberations of the Federal Bureau of Investigation? It is a mockery of those who have their lives in Korea that no nation, including our own, has had the courage to take formal action in the General Assembly designating the Soviet Union as the aggressor. It is the violator not only of the above resolutions but, as I shall now show, is a willful saboteur of the Charter of the United Nations itself.

I realize that the policy of the former administration was not to advance such a resolution. Recently I read the speech of Ernest A. Gross, who was one of our representatives to the United Nations and has been continued on as deputy United States representative by the present administration.

In an address he made on February 4 at Philadelphia, carried in full in the Department of State Bulletin of February 23, he had this to say on the subject:

The question is sometimes asked why, since the Soviet Union has unquestionably sponsored and supported the Korean aggression, they should be permitted to retain membership in the United Nations. I have already pointed out there is no way of expelling them, since they can veto a decision of that sort.

In answer to Mr. Gross I would say that a vote on such a resolution would certainly separate the men from the boys, and a nation that had so far lost its standing among the law-abiding nations of the world that it had to veto its own expulsion would have a hard time explaining this fact to the world and to its own enslaved people.

Secondly, the veto could not be used against the resolution declaring the Soviet Union an aggressor any more than it could be used against the one declaring the Chinese Communists regime as an aggressor. It was for the purpose of removing the veto that we took the action to the General Assembly rather than the Security Council.

Then, to return to the Gross speech:

Even if this were not so, I think it does not take full account of the realities of the situation to regard membership in the United Nations as a sort of badge of merit. There are advantages in universal membership, even including recalcitrants, for reasons I have just attempted to explain.

Frankly, I believe those advantages are questionable, to say the least. When the United Nations was born in San Francisco in June of 1945 there were less than 200 million people behind the Iron Curtain. Now there are more than 800 million. The endless debates and discussions in the United Nations are small comfort to the enslaved.

Has the advantage of having a restricted American Ambassador in the Soviet Union been of real value to us when compared to the damage done by Communist diplomatic missions acting as centers of espionage in the West as proven by the Canadian atomic spy ring, the Fuchs, and other cases in this country? There is ample reason to believe that from time to time there has been espionage penetration of our embassies

by planted operatives. Do any but the most naive doubt that the household help we are required to hire in the Soviet Union are all approved and perhaps trained by the Soviet secret police?

Is our position vis-a-vis the godless Communist tyranny in a relatively better or worse position than it was on V-E Day, on United Nations Charter signing day, and on V-J Day, all of which events took place in 1945? Then the whole world had confidence and faith in the moral, economic, and military power of the free world to overcome the greatest aggregation of tyrannical power the world has ever known. Even though the Soviet Union may have secretly hated us while our ally, there is no doubt they respected our power.

Now, after 2 years and 8 months of stalemated war in Korea, when the United States of America with the alleged support of the United Nations is stopped cold by North Korean and Chinese Communists, does any realistic person think this has contributed to faith and confidence on the part of Asiatics or Europeans in the ability to resist the power of the Kremlin, which has not committed a single division? Were our hands not tied by the neutralists in the United Nations, some acting by fear and some by design? Whose purpose has been really served? Are we to be immobilized until we can be struck a mortal blow?

Mr. Eden to the contrary notwithstanding, will he be better able to carry out the resolutions of the United Nations 2 years from now under this policy of restrained stalemate? We know that when the Soviet Union used the United Nations to propose his cease-fire negotiations the Communist forces were in desperate shape. Our field commander was not consulted nor was his advice sought on the wisdom of our acceptance of the Soviet maneuver.

Since the Chinese Communists have formally rejected the so-called Indian resolution, the United Nations should withdraw it and propose instead that the Republic of Korea be united and that its sovereignty, independence of any outside power, and neutrality be guaranteed by all the great powers as well as by the United Nations.

A divided Korea will be a constant menace to peace. A divided Korea cannot be a free Korea without perpetual military and economic support from the free world. A divided Korea without such support would ultimately be a Communist Korea and a dagger pointed at Japan. The longer this basic issue is avoided the more difficult the solution will be unless India, Yugoslavia, and the Soviet Union are sooner or later to propose in the United Nations a far eastern Munich type of settlement. They may believe that a stalemate carried on for another year or two would so soften up our determination to maintain a free world of freemen that we would yield to the voice of the siren.

Even on the limited prisoner-of-war issue we should forthwith declare that it is no longer acceptable to have a repatriation commission consisting of two Soviet satellites—Czechoslovakia and Poland—one of whom has just shot

down an American jet over Western Germany, and two "neutrals"—Sweden and Switzerland—all of whom have recognized Communist China and none of whom have helped to resist this first overt act of aggression in Korea. Who will preserve order and protect the non-Communist prisoners if the fanatical Communists start another Kojima Island type of riot on a neutralized island?

We, of course, should be prepared to negotiate for a peace with honor. But not another Munich, Yalta, or Potsdam conference where the territories or people of countries unrepresented were disposed of by representatives of the great powers meeting in secret session.

The charter of the United Nations which was signed at San Francisco on June 26, 1945, states in its preamble that the purpose of the organization is "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind."

It also states the following:

To insure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest.

Article I lists the purposes of the United Nations. The following is contained in subsection 1:

To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace.

Article 2, subsection 2, provides:

All members, in order to insure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership, shall fulfill in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the present charter.

Subsection 4 provides:

All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

Subsection 5 provides:

All members shall give the United Nations every assistance in any action it takes in accordance with the present charter, and shall refrain from giving assistance to any state against which the United Nations is taking preventive or enforcement action.

Subsection 6 provides that—

The organization shall insure that states which are not members of the United Nations act in accordance with these principles so far as may be necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Chapter 7, article 39, provides:

The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression, and shall make recommendations, or decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with articles 41 and 42, to maintain or restore international peace and security.

I again call to the attention of the Senate of the United States and to the attention of the representatives of the member states of the United Nations that for more than 2 years and 8 months after the aggression took place, and 2 years after Communist China was named

an aggressor by the General Assembly, none of these resolutions have been lived up to by the total membership. The provisions of the charter have been violated by the Communist regimes of North Korea and China, and in their actions these two declared aggressors have had both the moral and material support of the Soviet Union.

Article 41 provides:

The Security Council may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions, and it may call upon the members of the United Nations to apply such measures. These may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations.

As I have heretofore pointed out, not only have we been faced with the spectacle of 43 out of the 60 United Nations members furnishing no force whatsoever to resist aggression, but we also find that some of our fellow members in the organization, as well as nations outside of it, have been furnishing manufactured and raw materials to the Chinese Communists and North Korean Communist aggressors. In 1952, last year, 2 years after the aggression broke out, the total importation into Communist China amounted to over \$1,250,000,000, by United States dollar value. Of this total, approximately \$550 million came by sea, and \$700 million overland.

I am not impressed by the argument used that if a complete naval blockade cut off shipments by sea, the Soviet Union would make up the difference by shipment over the Trans-Siberian and Manchurian railway systems. In the first place, there is grave doubt as to the capacity of those rail lines to handle the additional burdens; and even if a substantial part could be handled, it would tie up and wear out a great deal of the rolling stock, and would make means of transportation for other Soviet adventures they may be planning elsewhere less available.

Nor am I impressed by the argument of the British Foreign Secretary in his speech before the Foreign Policy Association in New York on the evening of March 12, when he commended the May 1951, resolution about the denial of strategic materials to Communist China. The joker is, of course, in the word "strategic." No one has claimed that the British have shipped guns or ammunition, tanks or planes or war planes to Communist China. However, many shipments have been made in British vessels, in ships of other members of the United Nations, and, before an aroused Congress insisted on effective controls being instituted, in American ships, as well.

These shipments were and are of great value to the Chinese Communists by contributing to the soundness of their economy, thereby bolstering their morale, their effectiveness for domestic production of war goods, and their transportation of munitions of war which, to a considerable extent at some point in the operations, traveled by railroad or truck. Let me cite the type of materials purchased from abroad by the Chinese Communists in 1952:

Trucks, motorcars, motorcar parts, tires, seagoing vessels of varying sizes, radio receivers and transmitters, vacuum tubes, steel wire, gasoline, diesel oil, kerosene, power motors, generators, steel plates, steel bars, steel pipes, cast iron, scrap iron, tinplate, iron sheets, zinc plates, welding equipment, photograph equipment, rubber, medicine and medical supplies, chemicals, and cotton, to mention only a partial list.

While the recent statement relative to the conference between the British Foreign Secretary and our own Secretary of State regarding the tightening up process with respect to shipments to Communist China discloses a small step forward in the right direction, it should not be used to lull the people of this country into a false sense of security in the thought that these half measures will do the job that needs to be done.

In and of itself it will curtail some trade, but those who are determined to circumvent any restrictions will soon find ways of getting around the new controls, as, indeed, they are already doing.

In more than 2 years and 8 months of aggression, the United Nations has not made full use of article 41 by applying its provisions for either economic or moral sanctions. To the contrary, there are 17 members of the United Nations who recognize the Communist regime of China, and have continued such recognition and participated in an exchange of diplomatic representatives, even though the Communist regime of China is making aggressive war upon the United Nations forces in Korea.

These nations, some of whom have a limited number of men fighting in Korea, are Russia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Yugoslavia, Burma, Israel, Afghanistan, Norway, United Kingdom, Pakistan, Sweden, India, Denmark, Netherlands, Indonesia, Byelo Russia, and Ukraine.

Article 42 of the Charter provides:

Should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in article 41 would be inadequate or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of members of the United Nations.

Article 48 provides:

1. The action required to carry out the decisions of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security shall be taken by all the members of the United Nations or by some of them, as the Security Council may determine.

2. Such decisions shall be carried out by the members of the United Nations directly and through their action in the appropriate international agencies of which they are members.

Referring back to the resolutions passed on June 25, 1950, and February 1, 1951, the United Nations did not call on only a part of the membership. In each instance it called on all members to furnish aid and assistance to the Republic of Korea and to refrain from giving assistance to the aggressors in Korea.

In the light of this documentation, let us now turn to the speech of the then Soviet Minister, Andrei Y. Vishinsky, at the United Nations on March 2, 1953.

Mr. Vishinsky is now the permanent representative of the Soviet Union at the United Nations.

Speaking as the official representative of the Soviet Government and as its representative in the United Nations Organization Vishinsky said:

I might add, incidentally, that it is no accident that Mr. Lodge and his Government persevere, as regards the Korean question, in carrying out the Truman-Acheson government's line, since that administration had prepared and carried out the intervention in Korea, and since that administration had unleashed the barbarous and bandit-like war against the Korean people.

What sense of complacency has come over the United Nations itself and the decent governments represented therein and the people who desire an effective system of collective security that they can continue to tolerate a government whose spokesman continues the sabotage and aids the aggressors for more than 2 years and 8 months. Have we completely lost our sense of reality?

Is the wolf to be continually invited by the shepherd to help guard the sheep?

The American people have the right to ask not only the executive branch of this Government, but the United Nations Organization itself and each of its members, what they intend to do now to take effective action in Korea.

We have listened for more than 2½ years to the representatives of the Soviet Union using the United Nations as a sounding board for Communist propaganda. We have watched for more than 2½ years while timid members of that organization placed such restraints upon our Armed Forces that victory was denied and a costly stalemate invited.

This Nation, which has supplied more than 90 percent of the United Nations manpower and suffered more than 95 percent of the United Nations casualties, has the right to get more than lip-service support from those who pretend to believe in collective security under a system of international law and order that will preserve the peace of the world for ourselves and our children.

The road to appeasement is not the road to peace, but is only surrender on the installment plan.

The men who went to Munich to barter away the territorial integrity of Czechoslovakia without the presence of that government at the conference table may have thought they were assuring "peace in our time." We know now they only made inevitable World War II.

The men who went to Yalta may have thought that by the concessions made to Stalin at the expense of the Republic of China and the Free Government of Poland, whose representatives were not present, they may have been assuring a peaceful and cooperative Soviet Union.

We know now that it only made certain the destruction of freedom in Poland and accelerated the Communist domination of China which in turn led to Communist aggression in Korea.

Again quoting the then Soviet Foreign Minister Vishinsky in his March 2 speech:

The Soviet Union has never concealed the fact that it sold and continues to sell armaments to its ally, China. As is well known, the Soviet Union concluded with China in

1945, even before the Central People's Government of the Chinese People's Republic had come to power, a treaty of friendship and alliance. That treaty was confirmed in 1950 in a new treaty with the new Government of China. It was a treaty of friendship, alliance, and mutual assistance, concluded between the U. S. S. R. and the Chinese People's Republic.

In line with these treaties the Soviet Union has sold and continues to sell armaments to China, while China sells to the Soviet Union various types of raw materials, including strategic raw materials; and this is quite natural.

There we have it laid down cold by the official spokesman of the Soviet Union.

The gangster boldly proclaims he has sold the weapon to the murderer for the killing of the policeman and the defenseless citizen as well. He comes to the police department and the city council and admits his guilt, admits the violation of the charter and the resolutions that have been passed and says, in effect, "What are you going to do about it?"

Mr. President, that is a good question for the United Nations, for the United States, and for the free people of the world. What are we going to do about it? How long is this condition to be tolerated?

What steps are to be taken to declare the Soviet Union the aggressor that it is in Korea?

Not even the timid members of the United Nations, of whom there are too many, can or will deny that for 2 years and 8 months the Soviet Union gave moral support first to the Korean Communist aggressors, then to the Chinese Communist aggressors.

There has been no doubt for 2 years and 8 months that ammunition, arms, planes, and tanks, and technical assistance have been furnished by the Soviet Union to the aggressors.

The evidence has been overwhelming and the proof indisputable. But here on the second day of March of this year the Soviet Union, through its official spokesman, not only admits its guilt, but proudly proclaims it.

Yes; the question is a good one. What are we going to do about it? How long are we expected to carry on a stalemated and costly war in Korea in manpower and in resources under a new doctrine which, for the first time in our history, asks that our men fight and die, but we dare not let them win.

Do the nations that advise such restraint really think that time is in favor of the free world? In January of 1950, our friend and associate, Great Britain, recognized Communist China. To this date, Communist China has not recognized Her Majesty's Government.

Has the moral conscience of the world so degenerated that the respectable and law abiding nations of the world can now grasp the bloody hand of Communist Korea, Communist China, and the master hand of the Soviet Union, whereas it was unthinkable for them to continue diplomatic representation with the aggressors Hitler and Tojo just a decade ago?

Do the nations which continue relationships with Communist China and the Soviet Union, thereby giving to each a place among the decent nations of the world, believe that they gain the respect

of either the slave people of the world or the free by so doing?

Even the United Nations Charter itself clearly contemplated that the withdrawal of recognition could be an effective weapon as a moral sanction.

It could serve notice on those who are behind the Iron Curtain, not of their own choice, that no longer would the decent and law abiding nations of the world recognize a government which participated in aggression, supported it morally and materially and proclaimed its lawlessness to the world.

Has the United Nations come to such a point that the ruthless men of the Kremlin are to be faced by timid men and appeasers of the free world, and that while we follow another disastrous "wait for the dust to settle" policy the debates will go on, the resolutions will be passed, the appeasers will come forth with their 1952 version for a far eastern Munich, and time will run out.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I prefer not to yield until I have concluded.

Because there are some who constantly state that those of us who are critical of the policies this Government followed in Asia since Yalta are operating with the benefit of hindsight, I may perhaps be pardoned for calling attention to some remarks which were made before the outbreak of the Korean war.

On April 10, 1950, 2½ months before the North Korean Communist invasion of the Republic of Korea, I spoke on the question of American policy in Korea:

The Government of Korea has been constantly faced with the overt acts of aggression across the 38th parallel by Communist irregulars from north of the line. At the time I was in Korea last November there had already been 360 violations of the 38th parallel by Communist groups from North Korea ranging in size from a squad to a battalion. Many additional violations of the border have taken place since last November, the latest being a few days ago. President Syngman Rhee recently pointed out that there had been substantial casualties on the part of the forces of the Republic of Korea, and there have been considerably greater casualties on the part of the invading forces. Needless to say in that part of the world the cold war is quite warm.

There are a number of responsible people in the Republic of Korea who believe that once the Chinese Communists have liquidated the remaining resistance by the forces of the Republic of China to their regime that they will then move both Communist troops and equipment back into Manchuria and make them available to the North Korean Communists for an invasion against the Republic of Korea. (Pp. 4983-4985, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 96, pt. 4, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)

Seven and one-half months earlier on September 26, 1949, I spoke on the floor of the Senate opposing the nomination of Walton Butterworth to be Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs:

In view of the President's atomic announcement of Friday, September 23, may God grant there is time to rectify, in part at least, the Asiatic debacle now in the making even while we meet here today.

Boldly and affirmatively we have developed and maintained a foreign policy in Europe. In many of its aspects it has originated or developed as a result of Republican consultation and support. The world knows

what that policy is. In my opinion it has the overwhelming support of the American people. It is to help maintain freedom against communism, the most tyrannical and brutal force with which the world has had to contend. It is to support a system of international law and order so that the peace of the world will be secure against aggression, whatever its source.

In China we have had no similar bipartisan foreign policy. To be brutally frank, for the years since the close of World War II we have had no policy that could command the respect or support of the Congress and the Nation.

We have vacillated all over the lot. We have attempted to interfere in China's internal affairs by attempting to force a coalition with the Communists. We have done this subsequent to the time when it was clear that coalition with communism is unwelcome except as a means of facilitating complete Communist domination.

The more I have studied the China white paper and the documents left out of it, the less satisfaction I have, as a citizen of this country and as a Senator of the United States, relative to what we have done and what we have failed to do.

With great reluctance I say that our record in China during the past 4 years is not one in which this or future generations of Americans can take pride.

We have broken our word time and time again, we have abandoned a friend and ally in need and we have contributed to the disaster of allowing China, with her 470 million people, to be almost overwhelmed by militant communism, knowing full well that if all of China falls there is little that can be done to save southwest Asia or perhaps the entire continent.

We have done this in the face of repeated warnings from Gen. Douglas MacArthur, Admiral Badger, Ambassador Hurley, former Ambassador Bullitt, Generals Wedemeyer and Chennault, as well as many other competent observers. (Pp. 13264-13270, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 10, 81st Cong., 1st sess.)

On January 5, 1950—6 months before the Korean war—I made a speech on the floor of this body. My opening statement on that day in my remarks on American policy in the Far East was as follows:

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, within the last 90 days 2 catastrophic events have taken place. These are the Soviet success in atomic development, as announced by the President of the United States on September 23, 1949, and the establishment of a Soviet-recognized Communist regime in China. Only in retrospect will we be able to finally determine which event will have the most far-reaching influence. Both have set off chain reactions that have not yet run their full course. (P. 79, vol. 96, pt. 1, of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the proceedings and debates of the 81st Cong., 2d sess.)

Then, on page 81, during the course of the same discussion, I said:

It is a sad commentary that Britain, which itself was in such a desperate plight after Dunkerque, which joined us in complaining of Mussolini's stab in the back when France was down but not quite out, should now be contemplating abandoning the Republic of China and giving recognition, aid, and comfort to the Communists who are so closely allied with the same international Communist conspiracy that threatens human freedom in Europe.

Like Mr. Chamberlain at Munich, there are some in this country and in Great Britain who believe that by appeasing the Communists they may change their way of life. This is naive and such a viewpoint is danger-

ous to the peace of the world and the security of this country.

It is my judgment that history will record the recognition of Communist China as being as great a betrayal of human freedom as was the pact of Munich.

At another point I stated on that day:

It is long past the time when the Government of the United States must give to the Pacific region the attention it deserves. It is, of course, of vital importance that Western Europe, with its great industrial complex and its western civilization, not fall into Communist hands.

It is no less important that nations containing more than a billion people in Asia not become part of the Soviet orbit. The future peace of the world and the security of this Nation may well depend upon what happens in the Far East while most of our attention is being diverted to Europe.

As I pointed out, that was approximately 6 months before the outbreak of the Korean war.

Mr. President, are we to continue to follow a policy of drift and complacency and stalemate? Are we to continue to pour out substance throughout the world while recent testimony clearly establishes that we have not adequately faced up to the problem of delivering the hardware that our fighting men are entitled to and that we must have for the security of our Nation and the preservation of the freedom of the American people?

No longer am I willing to place our faith or our security in the hands of those who lack the moral courage to designate aggression for what it is and to take effective steps that will preserve a free world of freemen.

No longer am I willing to have Gulliver tied down by the Lilliputians.

This is no partisan matter. Some of us on this side of the aisle have for many years joined with some Senators on the other side of the aisle in pointing out the dangers inherent in the foreign and military policy we were following.

On August 26, 1949, there were only 9 of us in the Senate who voted to support appropriations for 58 air groups to build our Air Force toward the 70-group level when the then President and his defense spokesman were advocating it to be held at 48 groups. This time lost can never be regained.

The distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] made a speech on the evening of Wednesday, March 11, 1953, in Philadelphia in which he pointed out in very clear language the challenge which our Nation now faces and the steps which we must take if we are to rectify some of the errors. In his speech the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] said:

The face of the world was forever changed on a day in September 1949. That was the day the Soviet Union exploded the atomic bomb.

America then lost its monopoly of that weapon, and was thereupon faced with a peril it had never before known.

Later on in the same speech the distinguished Senator from Missouri said:

When in the fall of 1950, however, the Kremlin gave the order for the Chinese to cross the Yalu, Stalin's intention to take high risks for world conquest finally became clear to everybody.

Let me read some additional significant remarks:

Today the Kremlin's Chinese satellites, backed by Soviet pilots, tanks, and planes, cross and recross the Yalu.

At the same time we provide them with a military university for the instruction of their technicians at no loss to them except some equipment and a few pilots.

At very little cost to the Russians we are teaching them how to defeat us if they decide to expand the Korean war into world war III.

Rather than coming up with the truth to the people we follow the tragic steps of certain World War II allies by again attempting to purchase a nervous neutrality.

Again I propound the question, what effective steps do the members of the United Nations intend to take that will save that organization from the disintegration and futility that overcame the League of Nations?

Is there a single Member of this body who is willing now to risk our freedom, our constitutional form of government, and the lives of our people to the protection that could be afforded us by the United Nations Organization based on its Korean record? The answer must be an overwhelming, if not a unanimous, "No".

Is there any Member of this body who would approve of our becoming engaged in resistance to an aggressor elsewhere in the world if in advance we knew that we alone would have to furnish 90 percent of the manpower and that those associated with us would constantly place restraints upon our winning and would give aid and comfort to the aggressor?

Let the small nations of the world, as well as some of the larger ones, given proper consideration to the significance of their past acts, place themselves in our position and honestly answer whether they would have any call upon us, considering the fact that when the chips were down in Korea, they, like the townspeople in High Noon, were willing for the marshal to risk his life, but they themselves were not willing to become a part of the posse.

First. It seems to me that the very least that can be done now is to devote whatever energy, intelligence, money and effort that are required to place this Nation in a position of real strength.

Second. To find out forthwith which of our allies are prepared to take effective steps for collective security and to concentrate our efforts on those who have demonstrated by word and deed that they are ready to stand up and be counted, come what may. We cannot wait another 2½ years to get the answer to this question.

Third. To have introduced forthwith in the United Nations a resolution declaring the Soviet Union a supporter of aggression in Korea and a violator of the United Nations Charter, based on the available facts and the admission of their own representative.

Fourth. For our State Department to request immediately that the members of the United Nations who have recognized Communist China withdraw their diplomatic representatives to that aggressor regime.

This, more than anything else, would give hope and encouragement to the enslaved people of Communist China that

no longer would their aggressor regime be considered entitled to diplomatic relations with the self-respecting and law-abiding nations of the world.

Fifth. To take forthright action to declare a complete embargo or blockade of supplies going into Communist China.

Sixth. So consider the Far East as requiring the same unity of command as we have considered necessary in NATO and to call upon those free people of Asia who are willing to resist Communist aggression to join in a common Pacific pact of defense against further Communist aggression anywhere in that area of the world.

There is a song which says, "Give me 10 men who are stouthearted men, and I will soon give you 10,000 more."

If we will show by our words and our deeds that the people of Asia represented by the Republic of Korea, the Republic of the Philippines, Thailand, Viet Nam, and the Republic of China, all of whom now have forces fighting aggressive communism in Asia, that they, rather than the fence straddlers and the neutralists, such as India, will have our confidence and our support, I believe we can rally millions of people in Asia to the cause of the crusade for freedom and for the purpose of keeping their nations outside the Communist orbit.

There will be some in the United States and abroad who will point out that there are risks involved in any such policy. Respectfully I say to them that in my judgment there are greater risks in the policy of drift, complacency, and fear.

To those who raise objection, I propound these questions:

First. Based on the Korean war record, do you honestly believe that the United Nations is or has been an effective organization for collective security?

Second. Do you honestly believe that with the veto power exercised by the arsonist, the United Nations Organization can put out other fires elsewhere in the world any better than in Korea, where the fire has already burned for 2 years and 8 months?

Third. Do you honestly believe that the people of the United States of America can be expected to respond with alacrity to oppose other aggressions elsewhere in the world if they are to be faced with the problem of furnishing 90 percent of the United Nations manpower, suffering 95 percent of the casualties, and having their hands tied so that a victory is not possible and a stalemate is invited?

Fourth. Do you honestly believe that the United States of America, its Government, or its people, can be expected to pour their resources around the world to nations who are giving help to the aggressor, and to those who have not lifted a finger in opposition to this overt act of aggression which took place 2 years and 8 months ago?

Fifth. Do you honestly believe that the United Nations can survive and command respect in this country or abroad when the Soviet Union through its representative continues to use that organization as a sounding board for Communist propaganda and disparaging remarks concerning our Nation, that has already suffered 130,000 casualties in

trying to help make the United Nations something more than a futile debating society?

Sixth. Do you honestly believe, and are you willing to take the responsibility for lulling the people of your Nation into a sense of false security in believing that time is necessarily on our side?

Mr. President, when the United Nations Charter was drafted, the Soviet Union did not have the atomic weapon. It does today. When the Berlin blockade took place, the Soviet Union did not have the atomic weapon. It does today. When the Communists were overrunning all of China on the mainland of Asia, the Soviet Union did not have the atomic weapon. It does today.

In the 2½ years which have passed since the first atomic explosion in the Soviet Union, the Soviets have been stockpiling weapons and building their means of delivering them. Again I ask, do you really believe that time is necessarily on our side?

It is my firm belief that neither this Government nor any other will be performing the service it should render to its own people or to the cause of freedom if it permits the deadly cloak of complacency to cover the cold, hard facts growing out of a ruthless, godless, tyrannical communism, bent on the destruction of human freedom, individual dignity, and a belief in God everywhere in the world.

It was Abraham Lincoln who said:

Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation. \* \* \* We, yes even we here, have the power and bear the responsibility \* \* \* in giving freedom to the slave we assure freedom to the free. We shall nobly save or we shall meanly lose this last best hope of earth.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the speech which has just been delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from California. I remember that when I previously served in the Senate for a short time the Senator maintained a continuing interest in our policy in the Far East and was one of the first to point out the dangers of the policy which was then being followed.

However, as I have listened today to the distinguished senior Senator from California, I could not escape the conclusion that in rather large measure he was addressing questions to the United Nations which must be addressed also to the United States.

It happens that on occasions I served as either a delegate or an alternate delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations. There I recognized its inadequacies. Yet I see in it values which I believe have been overlooked in the speech which my distinguished colleague has delivered. I address myself to several of the points he made in his speech.

In the course of his speech the Senator from California designated several courses of action which should be undertaken by the United States. One of them is that members of the United Nations should furnish aid and forces in connec-

tion with the war in Korea. I concur with all the strength I have in that recommendation. There can be no question that many members of the United Nations have not lived up to their duties and their responsibilities in that respect.

The Senator from California also said that the United Nations should charge Russia with being an aggressor under the charter. There is no question that Russia is an aggressor and has violated the terms of the United Nations Charter. The point I make in this connection—and to it I invite the attention of my distinguished and able friend—is that when he says that the United Nations should declare Russia an aggressor he is saying to the President of the United States and to our State Department that they should instruct our mission assigned to the United Nations in New York to advocate action declaring Russia to be an aggressor. I make this point simply to say that it is not exactly correct to lay blame upon other members of the United Nations for not having charged Russia with aggression when that decision has not been made by our own country.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think I made very clear in my remarks that this government also had a responsibility for such action not having been taken. I did not lay the responsibility elsewhere, and I have been critical in the past of certain things which have not been done by the prior administration. However, I think we now have, particularly in view of Mr. Vishinsky's recent speech, an entirely new situation. While we had evidence of the participation of the Soviet Union in the Korean war and, as the Senator will remember, Mr. Austin exhibited before the United Nations organization certain Soviet equipment which had been captured from the Chinese Communists and from the North Koreans—and while we knew that the jet fighters which were being used to shoot down our planes were of Soviet manufacture—we do not know whether they are being flown by Russians or not, but we have very strong suspicion that some of them may be—while we knew of those things, nevertheless, it was the first time that the official representative of the Soviet Union had come into the United Nations organization not only to admit the guilt of his government but also proud to proclaim it.

It seems to me that that is something which neither the American people, the American Government—either in its legislative or executive branch—nor the free world can ignore; because when a large nation, merely because of its size, comes forward and says, in effect, "Yes, we are helping to commit this murder, we are supplying the arms which are being used to try to defeat the very purpose of the United Nations; we are proud of it; this is what we want done," and then we and the free world do nothing, it seems to me we completely stultify the entire United Nations organization.

Mr. COOPER. I will say to my distinguished friend that the recent statements of Mr. Vishinsky have not added anything to our knowledge that Russia has been assisting Communist China and

North Korea. But I do want to emphasize that I believe the implications of the statements the Senator made are more far reaching and much deeper than simply saying to the United Nations as a body, "You ought to declare Russia an aggressor." The truth of the matter is that the United States has the same responsibility as any other member, and if he says that to the other nations who are members, he must also say it to the United States, to the President and to the Congress.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have.

Mr. COOPER. Under the participation act which Congress passed, the representatives of the United States to the United Nations are under the direction of the President of the United States and the Secretary of State. So, the Senator is calling upon the President of the United States to instruct former Senator Lodge, our present Ambassador to the United Nations, to move in the General Assembly of the United Nations that Russia be declared an aggressor. I think that is a very far-reaching statement.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is my personal statement as a Senator of the United States, for which I take sole responsibility. But if the United Nations is to be preserved—and I happen to be one who has supported our foreign policy in the hope that we would build a system of international law and order that would preserve the peace for ourselves and our children—I do not feel that we would be performing a service either to the cause of a collective-security system or to a system of international law and order, if we were to continue to let the representative of Soviet Russia sit in the very inner councils of the organization, inviting, so to speak, the town arsonist to head the fire department, hear him admit the guilt of his nation, and then say, "Because you are a large and powerful nation, we will not take the action in regard to you that we would take in the case of the little regime in North Korea, or even in the case of the Chinese Communists who entered the conflict." I say to my distinguished friend from Kentucky that that is a doctrine which would recognize that might makes right, and that if a nation is big enough and powerful enough it can commit an aggression and sabotage an organization devoted to peace, and get away with it, whereas the United Nations itself would never permit a small nation to get away with it. If such a doctrine is finally countenanced and used as a precedent, then I say most respectfully—and again I am expressing only my own judgment—the United Nations is headed down the same road the League of Nations took when it became impotent to meet the aggression of Mussolini in Ethiopia and the aggressions by Japan in Manchuria.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, it was known at the time of our entrance into the United Nations that its greatest weakness would be the difficulty of dealing with aggression by one of the great powers who was a member.

I think the proposal which the Senator now makes is one which could really lead to outright war with Russia. In my opinion, that is the great question that

must be decided. It is unquestioned that Russia is an aggressor, and that it has violated the charter, but today we have to weigh these questions in the light of what are the best long-term interests of the United States; and what are the best ways to prevent a larger war. I think it is a much larger question than simply the denunciation of Russia as an aggressor. Even though we consider it from the standpoint of the best interest of the United States, I would not want to see this country take action which could only be one of words, and which could be interpreted as a final breach. I have raised these questions because I think there are much deeper implications than perhaps my good friend has stated in his speech.

#### SENATE PREROGATIVES CONCERNING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LEGISLATION

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, on Monday, March 9, the Senate passed by unanimous consent Senate Joint Resolution 52, which was thereafter transmitted to the House. This resolution appropriated \$17,000 out of the general fund of the District of Columbia for the operation of the Office of Rent Control in the District of Columbia.

On March 12 the House passed House Resolution 176, returning Senate Joint Resolution 52 to the Senate on the ground that it "contravenes the first clause of the seventh section of the first article of the Constitution and is an infringement of the privileges of this House."

I invite the attention of the Senate to a similar situation which obtained during the 82d Congress. On May 7, 1952, the Senate considered and passed S. 2703 which would increase the District of Columbia gasoline tax from 4 to 5 cents per gallon. At that time the House refused to consider S. 2703, also on the ground that it contravened the constitutional provision referred to in House Resolution 176.

It is suggested that the issue thus raised on two occasions within the past year by the House of Representatives involves not only a parliamentary question but a constitutional question as well.

Indeed, these recent House actions appear to constitute a challenge to the concept that home rule may be achieved in the District of Columbia by means short of a constitutional amendment.

The issue of whether such legislation can originate in the Senate was one aspect of the routine analyses the Republican calendar committee gave to these bills. Their consideration of the bills included a routine discussion of the parliamentary question with the Parliamentarian of the Senate, Mr. Charles L. Watkins. He stated that article I, section 7 of the Constitution does not apply to such bills. He reasoned that the bills do not contemplate the raising of Federal revenue; that they are limited in their application to the District of Columbia; and that, as such, like any other bill affecting the District, the Senate may initiate such legislation.

It is believed that additional comment on this subject may be of some interest for the record, because, actually, this is

not a routine subject to which I am addressing myself; it involves, rather, a major principle.

Article I, section 7, paragraph 1, of the Constitution provides as follows:

All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other bills.

Article I, section 8, paragraph 17, provides Congress with power—

To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such district (not exceeding 10 miles square) as may, by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States.

It is well established that the various provisions of the Constitution must be harmonized.

In expounding the Constitution of the United States every word must have its due force, and appropriate meaning; for it is evident from the whole instrument, that no word was unnecessarily used, or needlessly added. The many discussions which have taken place upon the construction of the Constitution, have proved the correctness of this proposition; and shown the high talent, the caution, and the foresight of the illustrious men who framed it. Every word appears to have been weighed with the utmost deliberation, and its force and effect to have been fully understood. (*Holmes v. Jennison* ((1840) 14 Peters 540, 570); see also, *Cohens v. Virginia* ((1821) 6 Wheat 264).)

There is no conflict whatever between the two provisions of the Constitution cited above, and where Congress exercises exclusive legislative power over the District of Columbia, article I, section 7, of the Constitution does not apply.

Only one case comes to hand that construes article I, section 7 of the Constitution. In *Hubbard v. Lowe* (1915) 226 Fed. 135), the District Court for the Southern District of New York had before it a challenge to the validity of a statute dealing with contracts for cotton futures. A bill which originated in and passed the Senate called for their exclusion from the mails. The House struck out all after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute by way of a prohibitive tax. The House version was the one which was ultimately enacted. The court in that case threw out the statute as being unconstitutional, since prior to enactment it had a Senate number—S. 1107. The question became moot because of the enactment shortly thereafter of a revenue bill which dealt with the problem of cotton futures.

It will be recalled that some years ago the Congress provided by statute for the establishment of local government in the District of Columbia. The legislative body of that government passed revenue and appropriation measures. In this connection, attention is directed to an 1885 decision in the case of the *District of Columbia v. Waggaman* (4 Mackey 328). The following is quoted from that decision:

We have to consider first, then, the validity of the act of the legislative assembly which imposed this tax on commissions earned by real-estate agents, and required a semi-annual return of those commissions and a bond to secure the performance of these and other acts prescribed by law.

In *Roach v. Van Riswick* (7 Wash. L. Rep., 496), this court held that the very broad

terms in which the organic act of 1870 granted legislative powers to the legislative assembly had the effect to clothe that body with only such powers as might be given to a municipal corporation, and that it was not competent for Congress to delegate the larger powers of general legislation which it had itself received from the Constitution. We are still satisfied with that decision; but we hold, on the other hand, that the provision referred to had the effect to bestow every power of municipal legislation which could be given to a municipal corporation, and especially the power of taxation and implied or included power to provide measures by which taxes may be enforced and collected. Section 49 of the organic act provided that "the legislative power of the District shall extend to all rightful subjects of legislation within the District, consistent with the Constitution of the United States and the provisions of this title"; and section 57 provided that "the legislative assembly shall not have power to tax the property of the United States, nor to tax the lands or other property of nonresidents higher than the lands or other property of residents."

The court referred to the legal tender cases and then went on to state that "the general grant of power to legislate on all rightful subjects, and so forth, is by inclusion, an express grant of power to legislate on this subject of taxation, except as limited in section 57." There is another case which bears on the subject, namely, *Welsh v. Cook* (97 U. S. 541, 542).

It can thus be seen that a local legislative body in the District of Columbia was given authority to enact revenue legislation affecting the District of Columbia; that pursuant to such authority that local legislative body enacted such revenue legislation; and the cited cases established judicial sanction for such enactment. If a local legislative body can pass valid revenue legislation for the District of Columbia, it appears equally clear that the Senate of the United States has authority to initiate a revenue bill concerning the District of Columbia. That conclusion certainly would be consistent with the Senate's share of responsibility in exercising exclusive legislative power over the District under article I, section 8, paragraph 17, of the Constitution.

There is a further aspect to the issue raised by the House last week in connection with Senate Joint Resolution 52. This is the question whether an appropriation bill comes within the purview of article I, section 7, paragraph 1 of the Constitution, relating to the raising of revenue. However, the issue of whether a general appropriation bill may originate in the Senate, notwithstanding long established custom to the contrary, warrants much fuller discussion than will here be made. As a Member of the Senate, I categorically dispute the House's contention in respect to Senate Joint Resolution 52.

#### UNITED STATES MILITARY PREPAREDNESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, within the last week, the world has witnessed two of the most brutal and unprovoked acts in modern times. Two aircraft, one belonging to the United States and the other to Great Britain,

have been shot down in cold blood. They were attacked, without provocation, while flying on routine, nonbelligerent missions.

It would serve no purpose for anyone to use these incidents as a springboard for a hysterical dive into panic. They are serious—indeed, grave. We have been brought face to face with the only too evident reality that our Nation could be thrust into total war in a matter of hours.

A show of firmness and unity on our part may convince the Communists who attacked our men that there must be reparations and that the present reckless course must end.

However, regardless of the outcome, we cannot afford to ignore the clear warning of the past 3 days. We can refuse to learn this clear lesson only at the peril of our lives and our liberties.

These incidents may serve to awaken us to the full magnitude of our danger. If we awaken in time, we can count ourselves fortunate. For it is only such an awakening that will save us from the threatened destruction that hangs over our heads.

We are now paying the price for the years of complacency and ease we shared together, the years in which we blindly shut our eyes to the realities that surrounded us. The price is bitter. It may be the price paid by the householder who checks his insurance only when the flames leap out of the basement and lick at the rafters.

There have been many years of such complacency—years in which we decided it was too expensive to pay the premiums on our insurance against aggression.

They began in 1945, when we demobilized with a haste that was neither prudent nor economical the mightiest army the world has ever known.

They continued through 1946, 1947, and 1948, when we peddled our military equipment as surplus at a fraction of its cost and without regard to the future.

They reached their high point when the funds appropriated by Congress to build a 70-group Air Force were impounded.

They were summed up in the pre-Korea era, when the needs of defense were placed second to the objective of convincing the country that military budgets could be slashed without weakening our preparedness.

The complacency, which was shared generally, continued even after the Korean war had spelled out its grim warning to democracy. Even then officials persisted in trying to sell our vital synthetic-rubber plants, our only reliable source of this material so crucial to military operations.

There were those who warned against this course of weakness and folly. There were those who refused to believe that it was more important to live in luxury than to preserve for our children and their children the liberties which we enjoy.

Among such persons were the members of the Senate Preparedness Committee, the group of which I had the honor to be chairman during the last two Congresses. It was a fine commit-

tee, all of whose members worked, without regard to politics, to strengthen our defenses.

In our very first report, issued on September 6, 1950, we warned against the "siesta psychology" that pervaded our defense program. Just 2 months later, on November 11, 1950, we cautioned that "paper-work preparedness is only flimsy protection against the threat we face."

Yet one year later, on November 29, 1951, a survey of the facts compelled us to report that complacency still ruled the defense program.

We said in our 35th report:

Deliveries on defense hard goods—planes, tanks, ships, and guns—have fallen dangerously behind schedule, and, as those deliveries have fallen behind, so, too, has our capacity to fortify the strength of our allies of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

A few months later, on March 20, 1952, the Preparedness Committee summed up the mobilization program in the following words:

The objective has been ample supplies of both butter and guns. The result has been a small number of guns and a great amount of butter, with a considerable number of lollipops thrown in.

On June 17, 1952, in our 39th report, we presented a summary of the views of the military commanders upon whom we rely for the defense of our country. I shall quote one paragraph from that report:

They (our military commanders) do not believe we have the strength we need; they do not believe we will have the strength we need unless we raise our sights at once and raise them drastically.

A few weeks later, on August 28, 1952, we reported that America had "lost the right to claim unquestioned mastery of the air. America is behind in the very weapon in which we should have unchallenged supremacy."

Mr. President, the situation was perfectly clear. The story was outlined in the reports of the Senate Preparedness Committee. It is available now, and was available then, when so many of the crucial decisions were made.

Nevertheless, the clear warnings were met only with stretchouts and cutbacks. Our preparedness program was stretched out and our defense production was cutback.

"Stretchout" and "cutback"—two of the most dangerous phrases in the English language today.

The real tragedy of our time is not that we lacked the ability to bring ourselves to the necessary level of military strength. The real tragedy is that we lacked the will to use the ability.

I have not reviewed the history of the last few years merely to rake over the ashes of the dead past. I have reviewed the past only because it points the way to the present and the future.

The lesson of the past is inescapable. We cannot have military strength by trimming our defense program to our desires for ease and luxury.

There is still another lesson to be drawn from the history of the post-World War II world, namely, that we cannot have freedom unless we are willing and able to defend it.

Have we learned those lessons?

There are many who even now advance such slogans as "balance the budget," "reduce taxes," "cut back military production," "stretch out the defense program," as the solution to all our ills. They would trim our defense program to what they consider the needs of our budget rather than trimming our budget to the needs of the defense program.

It may be that we can balance the budget, reduce taxes, cut back military production and stretch out the defense program. But if we do so and at the same time relegate our defense needs to a second priority, it will be at the peril of our lives and our liberties.

There are some who insist that we cannot afford the kind of defense program that will guarantee our survival. I am no economist—no expert in fiscal policy.

But I do know that the one thing we cannot afford is a defense program that is inadequate—a defense program too small to safeguard our liberties.

We cannot, of course, afford waste, because in total war the margin of waste could well be the margin between defeat and victory. No one has fought harder than I against military waste, but our objective should be to cut out the waste and institute efficiency—not to weaken our defenses on the excuse that some of our generals do not use their money and their authority prudently.

Our goal is the preservation of America as a free nation. If we lose sight of that goal, we will lose not merely our money, but our liberties.

The Communist pilots who shot down our plane and the British plane were merely the forerunners of the future. There will be other incidents; there will be other acts of provocation. If they continue we must sooner or later face the supreme test.

Are we ready to meet that test?

Our President faces responsibilities that are frightening. He must make the decisions that will determine the course of the future, that will decide whether we are to survive as a free Nation or succumb to the aggressors.

Thus far, he has had very little time to assess the situation and come to the necessary conclusions. But as many Members of Congress know, there are facts and figures on his desk which cannot be avoided and which I know he does not want to avoid. Soon—only too soon—the Congress and the people must reckon with those facts and those figures.

I believe the President should be told that he will have the support of the Congress no matter how difficult the decisions that must be made. I should like for him to think, with justification, that Americans will support him, not as Republicans and not as Democrats, but as Americans who place the salvation of their Nation above all else.

He has the responsibility for leadership because he is our Commander in Chief. In calm, measured words, the people must have the facts—the facts upon which decisions can be based. I hope that when the time comes the President and the Congress can work together to arrive at the correct answers to the basic questions before us.

Does an aggressor nation have the planes and the weapons with which the

United States can be attacked at any and every point?

Does an aggressor nation have a stockpile of atomic bombs that could be used to strike at every American city?

Do we have a defensive force adequate to beat off an attack?

Do we have a force that could deliver devastating counterblows against an enemy or have we placed our faith in equipment that is obsolete?

How much time do we have before an aggressor nation will be up to its peak strength?

Is our military force large enough to keep pace with the build-up of the aggressor or should we be building more?

There are answers to all those questions, and they are not pleasant answers. But they must be faced. The alternative is to drift helplessly into extinction.

We live in the age of the totalitarians—an age in which war is total, victory is total, and defeat is total. It is also the age of the atomic bomb—an age in which the first battle may decide the war.

We cannot wait to decide upon a course of action after the bombs begin to fall. We must decide now—now while there may still be time.

We do not know how much time still remains. That is the factor that is out of our hands—the factor that we cannot control.

We can appropriate money, mobilize manpower, and step up production. But we cannot appropriate 1 minute, mobilize 1 hour, or step up the number of days.

We must use our time and use it wisely. Whatever we waste can never be recovered.

Furthermore, there is only one yardstick by which the size of our defense program should be measured. It should be no smaller than the force needed to defend our lives and our liberties. Anything smaller is waste—tragic waste that we cannot afford.

I sympathize deeply with those who wish to introduce more economy and more efficiency into our Armed Forces. No one has fought harder than I for those goals.

We can have greater economy and efficiency. But we must not permit our zeal to lead us into the false economy of weakening our defense structure in what may well be the hour of our greatest need.

I emphasize the fact that we pointed that out in each of our 44 reports. Those reports were agreed to unanimously by Democrats and Republicans alike.

I am not speaking as a partisan nor do I think this is a partisan subject. The reports of the Senate Preparedness Committee were signed by all members—both Democrats and Republicans.

The American people are looking for leadership to defend their country. They do not care whether that leadership comes from Democrats or Republicans so long as it is effective.

We are past the stage where we can afford partisan bickering. We must discard trivialities and petty arguments. It is far more important to determine how we will get out of this situation than how we got into it.

We are in it. We must look to the past only insofar as it is a guide for the future.

We can, if we wish, exhaust our strength and squander our substance through partisan quarrels that serve only to set American against American. We can, if we wish, use our time and our energy in searching the records of the past for minute details that will pin down the blame for our present situation.

Personally, I would rather concentrate our strength and mobilize our substance against the Soviet enemy who threatens our lives and our liberties. Personally, I think we will find that there is enough blame for all of us to share. It would be better if we were all to concede the errors of the past without further divisive argument and proceed to work toward the only worthwhile goal—the defense of our country.

Mr. President, the incidents in the air space over Germany were but the handwriting on the wall. They indicate clearly the shape of the future. If we are incapable of understanding that future we have no one to blame but ourselves.

It would be tragic were we to be caught unprepared—with defenses that were inadequate and forces incapable of delivering a counterblow. It would be even more tragic if we were caught unprepared simply because of timidity—simply because we hid from the facts.

There may still be time—time to arm—time to arouse ourselves to the defense of our lives and liberties. Let us seize that time. Let us use it to forge defenses so strong that freedom will triumph over the designs of the aggressor and guide mankind throughout eternity.

#### ST. PATRICK'S DAY

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, tomorrow will be St. Patrick's Day, a day dedicated to the patron saint of Ireland, that little Nation which has won the hearts of all who know the story of its gallant fight for freedom.

It has become traditional in America and, indeed, in every corner of the world wheresoever Irishmen have wandered from their native land to observe the feast day of St. Patrick.

Though more than 14 centuries have elapsed since St. Patrick brought the gospel of Christianity to the Irish people, his spiritual influence still continues and his memory is cherished in story and song to a greater degree possibly than that of any other national hero or saint.

On St. Patrick's Day we are not celebrating a victory of war; we are not gloating over the conquest or repression of any people. The Irish claim no heritage of superiority in the great human family; they seek simply to uphold the principles of justice and freedom which all mankind so deeply yearns for.

The age-long fight of the Irish for freedom in their homeland will live for all time in history. That historic struggle for freedom, which continued from the day when Strongbow, Earl of Pembroke, with powerful British forces, invaded Ireland in the 12th century, down to the date of the British treaty which recognized the Irish Free State as a free

and self-ruling Commonwealth, is a story of bravery and patriotism unexampled in all human annals.

Since the Irish Treaty and the establishment of the Free State Government in Dublin, Ireland has made extraordinary progress in setting up a democratic government which, for adherence to pure fundamental principles of justice, of morality, and of Christian precepts, is not excelled anywhere in the world. Great strides have been made in balancing the Irish economy, making it more self-reliant, and bringing about social and economic readjustments and improvements of far-reaching effect. The rapid development of home industries, the establishment of hydroelectric power plants, and extensive public works and improvements of many kinds have literally transformed the Emerald Isle into one of the most happy and contented countries on earth.

And let me not forget to tell you in passing that Ireland has paid in full her debt to the American people who bought Irish bonds to aid the Irish rebels in their fight for freedom. She borrowed this money in America to prosecute that victorious fight. The Free State, freely and voluntarily, without the slightest compulsion, assumed that obligation and has paid it off in full. That should be an example in international honesty and good faith which richer and more powerful nations might emulate.

The one and only problem which remains to interfere with the full fruition of Irish nationhood and the full development of its economic and social possibilities is the wicked and indefensible partition of Ireland. I think this mutilation of the Irish nation—an act of British Tories separating a small and unwilling section of the north of Ireland from the Irish Republic—if not soon terminated will prove to be a most serious and dangerous error of British statesmanship.

No person conversant with Irish history can be misled by this partition, which is referred to as the Ulster problem. This small area of northern Ireland was arbitrarily set up by the British at the instance of intriguing politicians who were seeking the mutilation of the living body of the Irish nation and the perversion of Ireland's national destiny. In the counties under the Ulster government, if a free and honest election were held tomorrow, it would undeniably be found that the majority of the people are favorable to the unity of Ireland. It has never been a separate unit for any purpose—historic, social, economic, or traditional. It simply sets up an arbitrary fragment of the ancient province of Ireland, determined on by pure political intrigue. It represents the last fortress of British control in Ireland and can only be continued and maintained in violation of the spirit of the Irish Treaty by British financial aid, propaganda, and intrigue.

Mr. J. B. Morton, a distinguished English author and historian, in his book, *The New Ireland*, says:

Partition is an artificial state of affairs. Not one single Irish vote was cast for it. It serves not one solitary Irish interest. It can

only be maintained by active propaganda and sheer lawlessness. \* \* \* It would be powerless for the Ulster Government to continue without the financial and moral support of the British Government.

The partition of Ireland stands out as a conspicuous example of imperialistic oppression and perfidy which must disturb the conscience of British leaders. The First World War was fought and won on the principle of all nations having the right to determine the form of government under which they choose to live and to determine their own internal affairs without outside interference.

Mr. President, I know of nothing more important to the future welfare of the British Commonwealth of Nations and all the free nations of the world than the adjustment of this problem of Irish unity. The whole world is seething with political disturbance and dissension. Wars are threatening on every side. The Irish people, in these turbulent and dangerous times, are in a position to exercise a vital force for the preservation of democratic institutions. What a boon it would be in these threatening times, with dangerous "isms" the world over menacing democracy, to have a united English-speaking people. Such a force would be an invincible bulwark for democracy.

What the world sorely needs today is peace. Peace is not merely the removal of contending armies from the field of battle. It means the reestablishment of international justice and good will—the cessation of exploitation and oppression of weak countries. It means the deliverance of nations from policies of aggression and from the obsession of wasteful preparation for war. It means improvement of the conditions of the masses in all parts of the world, and the raising of the standards of living for all.

Ireland, where the taint of communism has not entered, will be a strong voice in the family of free nations. Wherever you find an Irishman today, you will find a champion of democracy and the rights of individuals. Yet his native land is not entirely free. The fact that Britain permits these conditions to continue, when they could be remedied to the benefit of all concerned, is an enigma which can never be explained or justified.

The world today is at the parting of the ways. Either it must take, through the ending of oppression of small countries, the path leading upward to an era of peace and prosperity which will be immeasurable; or else, through efforts to maintain huge military establishments exhausting the resources of the earth, it will sink through confusion and disaster to a ruin which will be irretrievable.

And so, Mr. President, on this St. Patrick's Day of 1953, let us hope that there will soon be an end to this British policy of partition in Ireland, so as to permit the Irish Nation to go forward in the development of its resources and improvement of its social and economic conditions, and thus stand out as an example to the world of the fruits of justice and freedom.

#### PROGRAM FOR THE SESSIONS OF THE SENATE ON WEDNESDAY AND FRIDAY OF THIS WEEK

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader what his plans are so far as the program of the Senate is concerned for Wednesday and Friday of this week.

Mr. TAFT. On Wednesday I intend to call up the measures on the calendar which were reported too late to be considered today. They include specifically the resolution to continue the Military Preparedness Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services. It is Order No. 77, Senate Resolution 86. Also, Orders Nos. 80 and 81.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is the program for Wednesday?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; that is the program for Wednesday of this week. Of course, there will be some nominations to be confirmed.

On Friday I know of no special business to be taken up by the Senate. Some additional bills may be reported by that time, as well as perhaps an important nomination.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. May I ask whether the distinguished majority leader has any hope that the so-called tidelands bill will be reported this week?

Mr. TAFT. I have some hope that it will be reported, but not that it will be taken up this week.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then am I to understand that the majority leader will not ask that it be considered even if it is reported, until next week?

Mr. TAFT. It could not be reported until Friday anyway, and certainly I would not move to take it up then.

#### DEATH OF DR. HERMAN BARUCH

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in this morning's New York Herald Tribune there appeared an article on the death of Dr. Herman Baruch.

I wish to pay brief homage to him at this time. When he was Ambassador to Holland it was my privilege to be his guest. In this age he was what one might call a mid-Victorian. The people of Holland loved him. He went out among the farmers and sold America to them. He has gone to his reward and it is well that there be noted in the RECORD the passing of a good public servant.

I ask unanimous consent that the article in the New York Herald Tribune be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DR. HERMAN BARUCH DIES AT 80; EX-ENVOY TO PORTUGAL, HOLLAND — FOLLOWED FATHER'S TRADITION AS PHYSICIAN, BECAME PARTNER IN H. HENTZ & Co.

WYANDANCH, L. I., March 15.—Dr. Herman B. Baruch, 80, former American Ambassador to the Netherlands and Portugal, died today at his home, Bagatelle. He achieved great distinction in his field, as did his three brothers in theirs: Bernard M. Baruch, the elder statesman; Salling W. Baruch, a financier, who now lives in San Marino Island, Fla., and Hartwig Baruch, a famous actor in

the 1890's, who died on March 1 at the age of 84.

Dr. Baruch, the third son of Dr. Simon B. and Belle Wolf Baruch, set his course early in the direction his father had taken. He was graduated second in the City College class of 1892, ranked similarly at the Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons in 1895, and placed first in the subsequent city-wide internship examinations. In practice and research, Dr. Baruch thereafter shared his father's deep interest in physical medicine.

Though he continued to write frequently for medical journals, Dr. Baruch in 1903 followed his brother Bernard into finance in the firm of Baruch Bros. Through a merger in 1918 Baruch Bros. brought special emphasis to the securities business of H. Hentz & Co., which this year will celebrate its 97th anniversary under the same name. The consolidation made Dr. Baruch a senior partner in H. Hentz. In 1945 he became a limited partner, but continued to maintain an office at the commodity house, at 60 Beaver Street.

#### NAMED TO BRAZIL POST

His gradual withdrawal from the stock exchange was prompted by a new diplomatic career. In 1943, he was made Chief of the Board of Economic Warfare's representatives in Brazil. It was felt his appointment would end the interdepartmental bickerings between the BEW and various RFC agencies. So many representatives of these groups were being sent to Brazil that the natives called them "paraquedistas," or parachute troops. Dr. Baruch's job, in large part, was to re-establish American operations on a plane that would hold the Brazilians' respect.

He soon reported that his and other agencies were working in full cohesion, and reminded himself and his superiors, "When my job is done, I shall return to private life." Instead, President Roosevelt, who leaned heavily on Bernard Baruch, appointed Dr. Baruch, who had been a Democratic presidential elector in 1932, American Ambassador to Portugal in 1945. President Truman extended his public career by making him Ambassador to The Hague in 1947.

#### HONORED BY DUTCH

Dr. Baruch often expressed his high regard for the Dutch, and particularly noted the "magnificent use of every dollar" of Marshall plan funds that they were making. The Dutch recognized his service by awarding him the Grand Cross of the Order of the Netherlands Lion. On January 1, 1949, he submitted his resignation to President Truman, and it was accepted.

Dr. Baruch's friends said the President's action came as a surprise to him. Ambassadors, like other officials of the executive branch, submit their resignations as a matter of form when the Chief Executive begins a new term. Although the Ambassador had not been involved in any dispute with the President, Bernard Baruch and the President had been on poor terms for some months.

On his return to America, Dr. Baruch, as president of the Simon Baruch Foundation, devoted its resources principally toward discovering the origin and cure of infantile paralysis. Last April he and Bernard Baruch broke ground for Baruch Houses, a 2,194-apartment project under construction on the lower East Side. The Simon Baruch public bath, one of the many his father established in New York, will be left standing in the project, and recalled the survey the two brothers made for the mayor in 1934 for the extensive renovation of public baths in the city.

#### BROUGHT BROUGHAM IN 1942

Dr. Baruch's name was newsworthy from time to time in minor ways. In 1942, with the oppression of gas rationing, he bought an elegant red and black brougham and put his chauffeur in appropriate livery. In 1937, newspapers told how he financed an expedition to Brazil to experiment with electric

eels. This was only a bizarre facet, however, of his fascination with animal and plant life. He devoted much of his energy to studying the correlation between them.

Dr. Baruch, moving to Long Island, began a nursery as a hobby in Wyandanch, but he soon found himself wholesaling thousands of chestnut and fruit trees, garden shrubs, and flowers, and could scarcely retire had he wanted to. The family said yesterday that a private funeral will be held at Bagatelle on Tuesday morning.

Surviving, besides his two brothers, are his second wife, the former Anne Marie, Baroness Mackay, of the Hague; two children by a previous marriage to the late Mrs. Rosemary Emetaz Baruch, Robert P. Baruch and Mrs. Marina Symmers, of New York; and three grandchildren.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate adjourn until Wednesday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, March 18, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 16, 1953:

##### GOVERNOR OF GUAM

Ford Q. Elvidge, of Washington, to be Governor of Guam.

##### UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Leo A. Rover, of the District of Columbia, to be United States attorney for the District of Columbia, vice Charles Morris Ireland, resigning.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 16, 1953:

##### GOVERNOR, TERRITORY OF ALASKA

B. Frank Heintzleman, of Alaska, to be Governor of the Territory of Alaska.

##### NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

Maj. Gen. Ralph Julian Canine, O7154, United States Army, to be Director of the National Security Agency, with the rank of lieutenant general and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

##### IN THE ARMY

Maj. Gen. Samuel Davis Sturgis, Jr., O9325, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), for appointment as Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 206 of the Army Organization Act of 1950 and section 513 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

##### To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Whitfield Putnam Shepard, O11908.  
Maj. Gen. Walter Joseph Muller, O12224.  
Maj. Gen. Paul Wolcott Rutledge, O7289.  
Lt. Gen. Williston Birkhimer Palmer, O12246.  
Maj. Gen. Robert Miller Montague, O12261.  
Maj. Gen. Harlan Nelson Hartness, O12269.  
Maj. Gen. Claude Birkett Ferenbaugh, O12479.  
Maj. Gen. Clovis Ethelbert Byers, O12769.  
Maj. Gen. Henry Irving Hodes, O12845.

Lt. Gen. Isaac Davis White, O15080.  
Maj. Gen. Thomas Francis Hickey, O16762.  
Maj. Gen. Ira Platt Swift, O12205.

##### To be major general, Medical Corps

Maj. Gen. William Edward Shambora, O16540.

##### To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Rex Van Den Corput, Jr., O12700.  
Maj. Gen. Homer Watson Kiefer, O12701.  
Maj. Gen. Crump Garvin, O12746.  
Maj. Gen. George Honnen, O12816.  
Maj. Gen. Orlando Clarendon Mood, O14781.  
Maj. Gen. John Francis Uncles, O14914.  
Maj. Gen. Robert Nicholas Young, O15068.  
Maj. Gen. Thomas Sherman Timberman, O15328.  
Maj. Gen. Edwin Kennedy Wright, O15475.  
Maj. Gen. Charles Day Palmer, O15519.  
Maj. Gen. Bruce Cooper Clarke, O16068.  
Maj. Gen. Leslie Earl Simon, O15567.  
Brig. Gen. William Henry Colbern, O6809.  
Brig. Gen. Charles Wilkes Christenberry, O8373.  
Brig. Gen. Edwin Luther Sibert, O11193.  
Brig. Gen. Joseph Jones Twitty, O12079.  
Brig. Gen. George Vernon Keyser, O12089.  
Brig. Gen. Robert Gibbins Gard, O12247.

##### To be brigadier generals, Medical Corps

Brig. Gen. Martin Eugene Griffin, O16537.  
Brig. Gen. Alvin Levi Gorby, O16546.

##### To be brigadier general, Dental Corps

Brig. Gen. Egbert Wesley Van Delden Cowan, O11744.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

##### To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Jonathan Lane Holman, O11226.  
Brig. Gen. George Bittmann Barth, O11241.  
Brig. Gen. Boniface Campbell, O9788.  
Brig. Gen. Leslie Dillon Carter, O10663.  
Brig. Gen. Charles Kenon Gailey, Jr., O12782.  
Brig. Gen. William Lemuel Mitchell, O12832.  
Brig. Gen. James Dunne O'Connell, O14965.  
Brig. Gen. George Craig Stewart, O15349.  
Brig. Gen. Charles Trueman Lanham, O15568.  
Brig. Gen. Charles Lanier Dasher, Jr., O15634.  
Brig. Gen. William Henry Maglin, O15812.  
Brig. Gen. John Albert Dabney, O16602.  
Brig. Gen. Guy Stanley Meloy, Jr., O16892.  
Brig. Gen. Robert Frederick Sink, O16907.

##### To be brigadier generals

Col. Kenner Fisher Hertford, O15120.  
Col. William Elgie Carraway, O15144.  
Chaplain (Col.) Patrick James Ryan, O17363.  
Col. Peter Conover Haines 3d, O15657.  
Col. David Henry Tulley, O16075.  
Col. Richard Walden Mayo, O16430.  
Col. Jeremiah Paul Holland, O16812.  
Col. Walter Morris Johnson, O16835.  
Col. Ralph Wise Zwicker, O16878.  
Col. Earl Clarence Bergquist, O16998.  
Col. Walter King Wilson, Jr., O17512.  
Col. John Elliot Theimer, O17566.  
Col. William Carson Bullock, O17635.  
Col. Thomas Weldon Dunn, O18157.  
Col. Carl Irven Hutton, O18177.  
Col. John Phillips Daley, O18358.  
Col. Sam Carroll Russell, O18678.  
Col. Dwight Edward Beach, O18747.  
Col. Louis Watson Truman, O18755.  
Col. William Wilson Quinn, O19283.

The nominations of Edward Francis Kent et al., for transfer in the Army, and the nominations of William Herschel Allen, Jr., et al., for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on February 25, 1953, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations."

beginning with the name of Edward Francis Kent, shown on page 1404, and ending with the name of June Elizabeth Williams on page 1411.

#### IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force to the grades indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

##### To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Roger Maxwell Ramey, 91A.  
Maj. Gen. Francis Hopkins Griswold, 94A.  
Maj. Gen. George Warren Mundy, 358A.  
Maj. Gen. Walter Edwin Todd, 361A.  
Maj. Gen. Frank Fort Everest, 366A.  
Maj. Gen. Frederic Harrison Smith, Jr., 461A.  
Maj. Gen. William Fulton McKee, 467A.  
Maj. Gen. Emery Scott Wetzell, 464A.  
Maj. Gen. Edward Wharton Anderson, 514A.  
Maj. Gen. Robert Whitney Burns, 527A.

##### To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. John Morris Hargreaves, 233A.  
Maj. Gen. Lucas Victor Beau, 174A.  
Maj. Gen. Byron Elihu Gates, 186A.  
Maj. Gen. Colby Maxwell Myers, 246A.  
Brig. Gen. Alfred Henry Johnson, 270A.  
Maj. Gen. John Stewart Mills, 357A.  
Brig. Gen. Homer LeRoy Sanders, 411A.  
Brig. Gen. Thomas Benton McDonald, 469A.  
Brig. Gen. John Walker Sessums, Jr., 489A.  
Brig. Gen. Lewis R. Parker, 438A.  
Brig. Gen. Jarred Vincent Crabb, 535A.  
Maj. Gen. Oliver Stanton Picher, 540A.  
Maj. Gen. Mark Edward Bradley, Jr., 552A.  
Maj. Gen. William Dole Eckert, 560A.  
Maj. Gen. Edward Julius Timberlake, 603A.  
Maj. Gen. Archie Jordan Old, Jr., 605A.  
Maj. Gen. Herbert Bishop Thatcher, 634A.  
Maj. Gen. Dan Clark Ogle, 602A.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the United States Air Force under the provisions of section 515, Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

##### To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Haywood Shepherd Hansell, Jr., AO17468.  
Brig. Gen. Edmund Clarence Langmead, 207A.  
Brig. Gen. Robert Lynn Copsley, AO104024.  
Brig. Gen. Thomas Randall Rampy, AO922780.  
Brig. Gen. John Morris Hargreaves, 233A.  
Brig. Gen. Homer LeRoy Sanders, 411A.  
Brig. Gen. Lewis R. Parker, 438A.  
Brig. Gen. Thomas Benton McDonald, 469A.

Brig. Gen. Joseph Harold Hicks, 227A.  
Brig. Gen. Paul Ernest Ruestow, 548A.  
Brig. Gen. David Hodge Baker, 557A.  
Brig. Gen. David William Hutchison, 601A.  
Brig. Gen. John Raymond Gilchrist, 836A.  
Brig. Gen. Kingston Eric Tibbetts, 436A.  
Brig. Gen. Jarred Vincent Crabb, 535A.  
Brig. Gen. Harlan Clyde Parks, 472A.  
Brig. Gen. Morris John Lee, 556A.  
Brig. Gen. Robert Edward Lee Eaton, 594A.  
Brig. Gen. Gabriel Poillon Disosway, 654A.  
Brig. Gen. Albert Boyd, 424A.  
Brig. Gen. Leigh Wade, AO403535.  
Brig. Gen. Deimar Taft Spivey, 385A.  
Brig. Gen. John Koehler Gerhart, 525A.  
Brig. Gen. Elmer Blair Garland, 322A.  
Brig. Gen. Charles Raeburne Landon, 712A.  
Brig. Gen. Lee Bird Washbourne, 810A.  
Brig. Gen. James McCormack, Jr., 17981A.

##### To be brigadier generals

Col. Auby Casey Strickland, 134A.  
Col. Ray Henry Clark, 212A.  
Col. John Phillips Kirkendall, 234A.  
Col. James William Andrew, 289A.  
Col. Joseph Gerard Hopkins, 339A.  
Col. Edward Harold Porter, 346A.  
Col. Joseph Arthur Bulger, 379A.  
Col. Edwin Lee Tucker, 420A.  
Col. Benjamin Scovill Kelsey, 433A.  
Col. Raymond Lloyd Winn, 435A.

Col. Harold Huntley Bassett, 445A.  
Col. Thomas Jefferson Dubose, 470A.  
Col. Harold Winfield Grant, 497A.  
Col. James Leroy Jackson, 503A.  
Col. Stoyte Ogleby Ross, 531A.  
Col. Frederick Earl Calhoun, 545A.  
Col. Royden Eugene Beebe, Jr., 587A.  
Col. Richard Tide Coiner, Jr., 619A.  
Col. Edward Willis Suarez, 633A.  
Col. Sidney Francis Giffin, 649A.  
Col. Marvin Edward Kennebeck, 18819A.  
Col. Russell Kellor, 798A.  
Col. Loyd Eugene Griffis, 19047A.  
Col. William Jeffers Kennard, 19048A.  
Col. Richard Mattern Montgomery, 1025A.  
Col. Richard Elmer Ellsworth, 1115A.  
Col. James Howard Walsh, 1120A.  
Col. Chester Witten Cecil, Jr., 1298A.  
Col. Augustus Maine Minton, 1301A.  
Col. William Porter Farnsworth, AO922626.  
Col. Edgar Eugene Glenn, 160A.  
Col. Herbert Leonard Grills, 432A.  
Col. Robert Shuter Macrum, 519A.  
Col. Llewellyn Owen Ryan, 521A.  
Col. Daniel Webster Jenkins, 528A.  
Col. Stanley Tanner Wray, 608A.  
Col. Thomas Samuel Moorman, Jr., 644A.  
Col. Claude Edward Duncan, 686A.  
Col. Millard Chester Young, 934A.  
Col. William Sebastian Stone, 1059A.  
Col. Raymond Judson Reeves, 1082A.  
Col. Thomas Cebern Musgrave, Jr., 1129A.  
Col. Russell Lee Waldron, 1164A.  
Col. John Dale Ryan, 1418A.  
Col. William Hugh Blanchard, 1445A.  
Col. Clifford Harcourt Rees, 630A.  
Col. William Edward Rentz, 918A.  
Col. Charles Wesley Schott, 949A.  
Col. William Monte Canterbury, 1071A.  
Col. Charles Pratt Brown, 1185A.  
Col. Major Samuel White, 19056A.  
Col. James Oscar Guthrie, 1266A.  
Col. Henry Russell Spicer, 1487A.  
Col. Thomas Patrick Gerrity, 1613A.  
Col. Ralph Emanuel Fisher, 240A.  
Col. Woodbury Megrew Burgess, 323A.  
Col. Alvord Van Pattern Anderson, Jr., 371A.

Col. Glynne Morgan Jones, 398A.  
Col. Alfred Frederick Kalberer, 607A.  
Col. Ethelred Lundy Sykes, 914A.  
Col. Benjamin Jepson Webster, 974A.  
Col. George Stewart Cassidy, 994A.  
Col. Karl Truesdell, Jr., 1023A.  
Col. Joseph D. Croft Caldera, 1048A.  
Col. Albert Theodore Wilson, Jr., 1086A.  
Col. Ira David Snyder, 854A.  
Col. Howell Marion Estes, Jr., 1211A.  
Col. Joseph James Nazzaro, 1241A.  
Col. Joseph Stanley Holtoner, 1283A.  
Col. John Dudley Stevenson, 1320A.  
Col. Thomas Alan Bennett, 1513A.

#### IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral in the line and staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

##### LINE

Joseph M. Carson	Edward N. Parker
Charles F. Chillingworth, Jr.	Lewis S. Parks
Howard L. Collins	Robert B. Pirie
Henry Crommelin	Lester K. Rice
William L. Erdmann	James S. Russell
Harry H. Henderson	John H. Sides
Ira E. Hobbs	John Sylvester
Willard K. Goodney	Edmund B. Taylor
Peter W. Haas, Jr.	John M. Taylor
Robert S. Hatcher	George C. Townner
Frederick N. Kivette	David M. Tyree
Victor D. Long	Frederick B. Warder
Redfield Mason	Joseph H. Wellings
Armand M. Morgan	Austin W. Wheelock
	George C. Wright

##### MEDICAL CORPS

Thomas F. Cooper.	French R. Moore
James R. Fulton	Ocie B. Morrison, Jr.
Bartholomew W. Hogan	

#### SUPPLY CORPS

Charles G. DeKay  
Frederick W. Hesser

#### CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Joseph F. Jelley

#### DENTAL CORPS

Ralph W. Malone

The nominations of Norgren B. Allen et al. (with the exception of Eleanor M. Halm to be a lieutenant in the Nurse Corps of the Navy, which was confirmed on March 6, 1953), for appointment in the Navy or in the Marine Corps, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on March 4, 1953, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Norgren B. Allen on page 1629 and ending with the name of Robert J. Vroegindewey, which appears on page 1630.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 16, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.  
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art unchanging in Thy love and goodness, we are again turning unto Thee for guidance and strength, for courage and hope.

We thank Thee that Thou art always willing to satisfy our nameless longings and to give us of Thy companionship and counsel as we walk the ways of life, which at times seem so very dark and devious.

May Thy spirit of peace and power descend upon our troubled minds and hearts, lifting us out of those fears which paralyze our energies into a faith which inspires us with confidence and joy.

Wilt Thou illumine our souls with a glorious vision of the fulfillment of Thy gracious promises when all our doubts shall be dispelled and righteousness and truth shall be victorious.

To Thy name we ascribe the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 12, 1953, was read and approved.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. VELDE asked and was given permission to address the House on Wednesday next for 30 minutes, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

#### AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Speaker, there is an old saw to the effect that some people achieve fame and others have it thrust upon them. I guess I am in that latter category because I was joined with